Golden Jubilee of India's Independence Series-25

POST-JAGANNĀTHA ALAṄKĀRA-ŚĀSTRA

M. SIVAKUMARA SWAMY

RASHTRIYA SANSKRIT SANSTHAN

Golden Jubilee of India's Independence Series-25

POST-JAGANNĀTHA ALAṄKĀRAŚĀSTRA

M. SIVAKUMARA SWAMY

RASHTRIYA SANSKRIT SANSTHAN
1998

Publisher :
Dr. K.K. Mishra
Director
Rashtriya Sanskrit Sansthan
56-57, Institutional Area, Janakpuri
New Delhi-110058
Tel.: 5540993, 5540995

© Rashtriya Sanskrit Sansthan

First Edition : 1998

Price : Rs. 100/-

Printer :
Apex Books Publisher & Distributors
5/21-A Vijay Nagar, Delhi-9

FOREWORD

I have great pleasure to present this volume of *Golden Jubilee of India's Independence Series* of Rashtriya Sanskrit Sansthan to our esteemed readers. The Volume verily represents the goodwill and cooperation, the Sansthan has all along been receiving from the distinguished scholars all over the country.

The Sansthan was established in October, 1970 as an autonomous apex body under the Ministry of Human Resource Development, Govt. of India with a view to promoting, preserving and propagating Sanskrit learning in all its aspects, with special reference to the in-depth shastraic learning. Apart from conducting the regular courses of studies at the constituent Vidyapeethas, it has been bringing out invaluable publications representing dissemination of knowledge contained in the various Shastras.

Thanks to the continued help, encouragement and support from the Ministry of Human Resource Development, Govt. of India that the Sansthan has grown in leaps and bounds and has been able to render its services to promotion of Sanskrit learning at national and international levels. Sansthan has decided to bring out 50 scholarly monographs by eminent Sanskrit Scholars of different fields as part of the academic programmes organised to celebrate the Golden Jubilee of India's Independence.

The present volume entitled *Post-Jagannātha Alaṅkāraśāstra* brings out in detail the unexplored area of Sanskrit Poetics i,e, the works of *Alaṅkāraśāstra* related to the Post-Jagannātha period (18-19th Century). It gives comprehensive picture of developments of *Alaṅkāraśāstra* with special reference to the works, authors and their contributions during that period. The book is valuable contribution for the comprehensive study of the development of the Sanskrit Poetics.

We are highly grateful to *Prof. M. Sivakumara Swamy* former Head, Department of Sanskrit, Bangalore University for contributing this scholarly volume for the *Golden Jubilee of India's Independence Series* being published by Sansthan.

The services rendered by my colleagues specially by *Dr. Savita Pathak, Dr. Viroopaksha V. Jaddipal* and Dr. R.C. Hota deserve special appreciation who have been working day and night for planning and organising the various programmes connected with the Golden Jubilee Celebrations, particularly the publications of the Golden Jubilee Series. *M/s Apex Books Publishers & Printers* deserve our thanks for bringing out this monograph on time.

K.K. MISHRA
Director
Rashtriya Sanskrit Sansthan
New Delhi.

12.10.1998

PREFACE

A critical study of the *Alaṅkāra* works of the Post-Jagannātha period (18th and 19th centuries) is presented in the present work. It may not be out of place to recollect the circumstance that led me to choose the subject for this monograph. A Seminar on *Sanskrit poetics* was held during 1972 under the auspices of the Post-Graduate Department of Sanskrit, Banglore University. Dr. V. Raghavan, who presided over the Seminar, made a suggestion that the study of the *Alaṅkāra* works of the Post-Jagannātha period (18th and 19th centuries) would be very useful to the academic world since the majority of the works of these centuries were still in manuscripts. Inspired by this suggestion I made a preliminary study of the *Alaṅkāra* works of these centuries. The consultation of the manuscripts of the *Alaṅkāra* works of this period deposited in Research Institutes and Manuscript's Libraries and of the brief notices of some of these works in the *Sanskrit Poetics* by Dr. S.K.De and the *History of Sanskrit Literature* by Sri. M. Krishnamachariar, enabled me to discover the scope of the present study. During this study, I prepared the critical editions of Varadārya's *Utprekṣāmañjarī* and Kṛṣṇāvadhūta Paṇḍita's *Sārasvatālaṅkārasūtra* belonging to this period. I also published some articles such as *The problem of Prastutāṅkura* and *The Problem of Prakṛtāprakṛta Śleṣa*, that were mainly inspired by the works of this period.

The study of the *Alaṅkāra* works of the Post-Jagannātha period (18th and 19th centuries) has yielded useful results in giving a comprehensive picture of the developments of *Alaṅkāraśāstra* in all its aspects enriched by the critical perspective and special points of the authors of the period. The results of this study have gone into the present work.

I am grateful to Prof. K.T. Pandurangi, my *Guru* and Head of the Department of Sanskrit, for his valuable guidance and kind encouragement at all the stages of this study. I gratefully acknowledge the guidance from Late Dr. V. Raghavan. I am thankful to Late Dr. G. Marulasiddaiah, Professor of Sanskrit, University of Mysore, for his valuable suggestion during the course of my study of the manuscripts at the Oriental Research Institute, Mysore. I am also thankful to Late Dr. K.Krishnamoorthy, Professor of Sanskrit, Karnatak University, Dharwar, whose suggestions in personal discussions and whose books and articles on *Alaṅkāraśāstra* have been of great help for this study. I am grateful to the Librarian, Adyar Library, Madras and the Curator, Government Oriental Manuscript's Library, Madras for the facilities they provided me to study the manuscripts at their rich Libraries.

I am thankful to *Dr. K.K. Mishra, Director, Rastriya Sanskrit Sansthan* for having brought out this work under the Golden Jubliee of India's Independence Series.

Bangalore
03.08.1998

M. Sivakumara Swamy

ABBREVIATIONS

A.D.	*Alaṅkāradarpaṇa*
Adyar	Adyar Library and Research Centre, Madras
A.J.	*Anaṅgajīvanabhāṇa*
A.M.D.	*Alaṇkāramaṇidarpaṇa*
A.N.	*Advaịtanavanītam*
A.S.	*Alaṅkārasarvasva*
A.S. Bhu.	*Alaṅkāraśirobhūṣaṇa*
A.S.Vim.	*Alaṅkārarsavasva Vimarśinī*
B.B.	*Balabodhinī on Kāvyaprakāśa*
B.K.	Bhāmaha's *Kāvyālaṅkāra*
Baroda	Descriptive catalogue of Baroda Oriental Institute
B.O.R.I.	Descriptive catalogue of Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, Poona.
B.S.P.	Bhoja's *Śṛṅgāraprakāśa*
Ca.	*Candrāloka*
C.M.	*Citramīmāṁsā*
D.A.Mj.	Devaśaṅkara's *Alaṅkāramañjūṣā*
Dhv	*Dhvanyāloka*
Dhv.L.	*Dhvayālokalocana*
D.K.	Daṇḍin's *Kāvyādarśa*
D.R.	*Daśarūpaka*
D.R.A.	*Daśarūpaka, Avaloka*

H.C.S.L.	History of Classical Sanskrit Literature: M.Krishnamachariar
G.P.N.	Haraprasad Shastri's Notices
H.R.	Haraprasad Shastri's Reports
K.A.M.	Kṛṣṇcārya's *Alaṅkāramuktāvali*
K.Bh.	*Kṛṣṇabhūpālīya*
K.K.B.	*Kavīndrakarṇābharaṇa*
K.Kn.	*Kāvyakalānidhi*
K.L.S.	*Kāvyalakṣaṇasaṅgraha*
K.P.	*Kāvyaprakāśa*
K.P.S.	*Kāvyaprakāśa Saṅketa* (Māṇikyacandra)
K.M.	*Kāvyamīmāṁsā*
K.S.K.	*Kavisamayakallola*
K.V.	*Kāvyavilāsa*
K.V.A.K.	Kirīṭi Veṅkaṭācārya's *Alaṅkārakaustubha*
Kāvyendu	*Kāvyenduprakāśa*
Kuval	*Kuvalayānanda*
Kuval.C.	*Kuvalayānanda Candrikā*
Kuval, Ka	*Kuvalayānanda Kārikā*
Kuval., R.	*Kuvalayānanda Rasikarañjinī*
M.M.C.	*Mandāramarandacampū*
M.R.C.	Madhusūdana's *Rasacandrikā*
M.O.L.	Madras Govt. Oriental Manuscripts Library
M.O.R.I.	Mysore Oriental Research Institute
N.A.S.	Nṛsiṁha's *Alaṅkārasāra*
N.C.C.	New Catalogus Catalogorum, University of Madras.
N.S.	*Nāṭyaśāstra*

N.Y.	*Nañjarājayaśobhūṣaṇa*
P.R.	*Pratāparudrīya*
P.R.R.	*Pratāparudrīya, Ratnārpaṇa*
R.A.M.	Rāmasudhī's *Alaṅkāramuktāvalī*
Ragh.	*Raghuvaṁśa*
R.G.	*Rasagaṅgādhara*
R.K.	Rudraṭa's *Kāvyālaṅkāra*
R.M.	*Rasamīmāṁsā*
R.R.	*Rasaratnahāra*
R.R.K.	Rāmapaṇḍita's *Rasakaumudī*
Rs. V.	*Rasaviveka*
R.V.	*Rasavilāsa*
S.A.	*Śāhabhūpālaṅkāra*
S.A. Kau.	Subrahmaṇya's *Alaṅkārakaustubha*
S.A.S.	*Sārasvatālaṅkārasūtra*
S.Cint.	*Sāhityacintāmaṇi*
S.D.	*Sāhityadarpaṇa*
S.K.	*Sāhityakaumudī*
S.Kd.	*Sāhityakalpadruma*
S.Kln.	*Sāhityakallolinī*
S.L.	*Sṛṅgārātlaharī*
S.P.	Sanskrit Poetics; S.K.De.
S.S.	*Sāhityasāra*
S.Sn.	*Sadalaṅkārasaṅgraha*
S.V.P.	*Śaṭhavairivaibhavaprabhākara*
S.V.R.C.	Śrīśaila Veṅkatācārya's *Rasacandrikā*
U. M.	*Utprekṣāmañjarī*
V.A.K.	Viśveśvara's *Alaṅkārakaustubha*

V.A.M.	Viśveśvara's *Alaṅkāramuktāvalī*
V.A.S.	Viśveśvara's *Āryāsaptaśatī*
V.E.	Vidyādhara's *Ekāvalī*
V.K.	Vāmana's *Kāvyālaṅkārasūtra-Vṛtti*
V.R.C.	Viśveśvara's *Rasacandrikā*
V.S. Ms.L.	Descriptive catalogue of Vidyādhīśa Sanskrit Manuscrpts Library of Prof. K.T. Pandurangi.
V.T.	*Vidvanmodataraṅgiṇī*

CONTENTS

Introduction

Alaṅkāraśāstra has a fairly long and varied course of history covering an extensive literature of more than 1500 years. During the period between Yāska's *Nirukta,* which gives the first theory of *Upamā* with special reference to its *Vedic* form, and Bharata's *Nāṭyaśāstra,* which gives the first outline of poetics which Bharata gives is first framework of the discipline as it existed in the earliest known phase of its history. Bhāmaha, Daṇḍin, Vāmana and Ānandavardhana represent the second and most creative phase of its history. The phase reaches the *highest peak of its glory* with the formulation of the *Dhvani theory* by Ānandavardhana. The poetic theories emphasising the paramount importance of *Alaṅkāras, Guṇa* and *Rīti* preceded the *Dhvani* theory, which in turn absorbed all the good points from them and reshuffled the older concepts of *Alaṅkāra, Guṇa, Rīti,* etc., in a new perspective with *Dhvani* as the central element of poetic charm (*Ātman*). This was followed by the third and scholastic phase working out the details of the *Dhvani* theory and giving a scholarly basis to it. Abhinavagupta and Mammaṭa are the great writers of this phase. Mammaṭa, in

particular, met the fresh challenges from the rival theories of *Dhvani*, viz., *Vakrokti theory* of Kuntaka and *Anumāna* theory of Mahimabhaṭṭa, and reaffirmed the soundness of the *Dhvani theory*. The *Vakrokti* and the *Anumāna* theories receded to the background for want of followers. The *Dhvani theory* which was accepted by major writers after Mammaṭa, is the only living and *widely accepted theory of poetics* in Sanskrit. Ruyyaka and Appayyadīkṣita, who deal mainly with *Alaṅkāras*, and Vidyānātha, Viśvanātha, Jagannātha, etc., who deal with all the aspects of poetics, have accepted it and developed their special points within its comprehensive framework. This is the rich heritage which the *Alaṅkāra* works of Post-Jagannātha Period (18th and 19th centuries) have inherited.

The studies of *Alaṅkāraśāstra* from Bharata to Jagannātha in modern times, started with the two pioneering works, viz., Dr. P.V. Kaṇe's *History of Sanskrit Poetics* (1923) and Dr. S.K. De's *Sanskrit Poetics* (1923). (These works were later revised and published in 1951 and 1960 respectively). These books led many scholars to the study of numerous works on *Alaṅkāraśāstra* and to produce books and papers dealing with its several aspects, the most notable of which are Dr. V. Raghavan's *Some concepts of Alaṅkāraśāstra, The Number of Rasas, Śṛṅgāraprakāśa*, Dr. A.Shankaran's *Theories of Rasa and Dhvani*, Dr. P.C. Lahiri's *Theories of Rīti and Guṇa* and Dr. K.Krishnamoorthy's *Dhvanyāloka*

(translation and study) *Dhvanyāloka and its critics.* Prof. M.Hiriyanna's articles now collected in *Art Experiece, Sanskrit Studies,* etc., and the various articles of Dr. V.Raghavan such as *Abhinava's polimathy, Rīti and Guṇa in Agnipurāṇa, Writers quoted in Abhinavabhāratī,* etc., have enriched the field of modern studies on *Alaṅkāraśāstra* from Bharata to Jagannātha. Dr. Kaṇe and Dr. De approach the subject from the historical point the view and present a detailed account of the major works and authors from Bharata to Jagannātha. They have also given a brief account of the minor works on the subject belonging to several centuries. Dr. V. Raghavan's *Śṛṅgāraprakāśa* is a valuable contribution to *Alaṅkāraśāstra* not only because it gives a detailed account of *Śṛṇgāraprakāśa,* an encyclopaedic work on poetics, but also because it gives the historical development of the various concepts of *Alaṅkāra-śātra* as a perpective background to the study of the concepts in this *magnum opus* of Bhoja. The other works mentioned above present the conceptual development of the different aspects of *Alaṅkāraśatra.*

As regards the works on poetics of 18th and 19th centuries, a passing reference to some of these works is made in the books and articles up to the present time. Dr. De has included a brief account of some of these in the chapter X of his *Sanskrit Poetics* Vol. I. Dr. Raghavan has given an account of some *Alaṅkāra* works of this period in his

introduction to *Śṛṅgāramañjarī* of Akbarśāha and *Śāhendravilāsa* and in his articles published in various Journals. Further a brief account of the works of this period is scattered in the works like the *History of Sanskrit Literature* by Prof. M. Krishnamachariar, *The contribution of Āndhra to Sanskrit Literature* by Dr. P. Sriramamurthy and *Āndhra Saṁsthānamulu Sāhityasevā.* (Telugu) by Dr.T.Donappa.

The above account of the modern studies of *Alaṅkāraśāstra*, with no pretentions to be exhaustive, is apt to draw the attention of the scholars to the fact that more or less a thorough study is made of the *Alaṅkāra* works ranging from early times down to 17th century A.D., but a full and systematic study of the *Alaṅkāra* works of the Post-Jagannātha period (18th and 19th centuries) is so far not undertaken to bring the study up-to-date. Hence, this study is undertaken as an attempt to highlight the contribution of *Alaṅkāra* works and authors of 18th and 19th centuries, constituting the last but not the least phase of Sanskrit *Alaṅkāraśāstra*.

The broad outline of the *Alaṅkāra* literature of this period is given here to indicate the scope of this study. On the basis of the information collected from various sources and consultation of the manuscripts of the different oriental libraries, it is estimated that the number of works is more than

80. Among these, about 30 works are printed and the rest are in manuscripts. Some of these works in manuscripts are noticed in the histories and regional surveys mentioned above. The rest of the works and authors are brought to limelight through this study. About 25 works of this period are comprehensive treatises dealing with all topics of *Alaṅkāras, Rasa,* etc. Among these, again, works dealing with *Alaṅkāras* constitute the majority. Works dealing with *Rasa* come next in number. A few works deal with *Śabdavṛttis,* Enigmatology, *Citrakāvya, Kavisamaya,* etc. Among all these works put together, works of the *Yaśobhūṣaṇa*-type form the majority. Thus the works of this period deal with a wide range of topics in *Alaṅkāraśāstra.*

A critical study of these works with an assessment of the contribution of this period to *Alaṅkāraśāstra,* is a profitable endeavour. As is evident in the subsequent study, the works and authors of this period have contributed some valuable points to the heritage of *Alaṅkāraśāstra.* As they come so late as 18th or 19th century, they have nothing much to add to the fundamentals of *Alaṅkāraśāstra.* Yet, the value of their contribution cannot be underestimated. The value of their contribution is in the following directions:

1. They have collected the material on the various concepts of *Alaṅkāraśastra* as it developed from the time of Mammaṭa down

to the time of Jagannātha and presented it in a scholarly and, at the same time, lucid style so as to bring a comprehensive view of the *Alaṅkāraśāstra*.

2. The authors of this period have produced a second series of compendiums on *Alaṅkāra-śāstra* from the 18th century onwards after the first series consisting of the works of Mammaṭa, Ruyyaka, Vidyānātha, Vidyādhara, Viśvanātha, Jayadeva, Appayyadīkṣita and Jagannātha. In doing so, these writers had an advantage which the writers of the first series did not have. They had at their disposal the rich commentatorial literature on *Kāvyaprakāśa*, *Alaṅkārasarvasva*, *Pratāparudrīya*, *Kuvalayānanda* and *Rasagaṅgādhara*, produced by such great scholars as Govinda Ṭhakkura, Nāgojī Bhaṭṭa, Jayarāma Nyāyapañcānana, Kumārasvāmin and Vaidyanātha Tatsat. These commentators have contributed subtle points for the defence as well as elucidation of the views expressed by their authors. The works and authors of this period (18th and 19th centuries) assimilate all the finer points made by these commentators in the exposition of the different topics of *Alaṅkāraśāstra* in their works.

3. The controversies between Appayyadīkṣita and Jagannātha are well-known. Each point of their controversy has a historical sig-

nificance. The analysis of these points is practically a reassessment of the contribution of *Alaṅkāra* writers from Bhāmaha to Jagannātha to the topic of *Alaṅkāras*. Appayyadīkṣita and Jagannātha have made some original points on the different concepts. It is in the assimilation of these points that the value of the *Alaṅkāra* works of the Post-Jagannātha period (18th and 19th centuries) is singificantly evident. Just as the controversies and the original points made by Appayyadīkṣita and Jagannātha have a retrospective perspective, so do they have a prospective impact on the subsequent period. The writers of this period (18th and 19th centuries) not only inherit these controversies and original points, but also bestow their critical skill in elucidating the points of view of their predecessors and contributing some points of their own to the discussion. In effect, this discusssion has become valuable for the clearer understanding of the points involved in the controversies between Appayyadīkṣita and Jagannātha and of the original views expressed by them.

4. The dialectical method of discussion and critical approach to the problems are evident in the discussions on all topics. All the shades of the topics are critically analysed and all the views of the earlier *Alaṅkārikas* are critically

presented and assessed in the light of their scholarship in the *Śāstras* such as *Nyāya* and *Pūrva- mīmāṁsā*. Here, in all these discussions, the authors contribute their special points.

Thus a study of the *Alaṅkāra* works of 18th and 19th centuries is bound to convince us that the *Alaṅkāraśāstra* has not become stagnant after 17th century A.D., but has been made fresh by the thoughts of the writers of the immediately succeeding centuries. This study aims to bring out the valuable contribution of the Post-Jagannātha period (18th and 19th centuries) to *Alaṅkāraśāstra* in the directions indicated above.

• • •

Part-I

Authors and Works of the Post-Jagannātha Period of *Alaṅkāraśāstra*

The field of *Alaṅkāraśāstra*, has been rich with the contributions of writers from Bharata to Jagannātha. The inspiration for the period under enquiry, i.e., Post-Jagannātha period (18th and 19th centuries), comes from Mammaṭa and his commentators, on the one hand and Vidyānātha on the other hand. Mammaṭa consolidated the concepts of poetics in the framework of the *Dhvani* theory. His commentators ably annotated his work with the knowledge of the *Śāstras* such as *Nyāya*, *Mīmāṁsā*, etc., at their command. Vidyānātha inaugurated a new genre of writing called *Yaśobhūṣaṇa* combining the two branches of poetics and dramaturgy. He also reshaped the concepts of *Pāka, Śayyā, Vṛtti and Rīti* and introduced more material regarding the concepts of *Guṇa, Doṣa* and *Alaṇkāra* under the impact of Bhoja. The contribution of Appayyadīkṣita and Jagannātha, which constitute the cream of all the developments in the repective topics that they treated, added another

dimension to Sanskrit Poetics with their *new ways of thinking*.

The *Alaṅkāra* works of 18th and 19th centuries imbibe all this heritage and present the topics of poetics or dramaturgy in a systematic manner. Although no new Theory in poetics or dramaturgy is promulgated by them, yet, they show their critical acumen in the presentation of topics and in the discussion and elucidation of the problems evolving out of the concepts. They show some originality in the interpretation of the time-ridden concepts in such a way as to remove the internal inconsistencies in their treatment. A study of these works will reveal how the writers of this period have not only maintained by and large the depth of this *Śāstra* but have also added some useful aspects of exposition with their scholarship. It is proposed here to give a brief account of the works and authors of this period in order to indicate the extent and scope of *Alaṅkāraśāstra* during this period.

It is a well known fact that good many works of the earlier centuries have been either *lost* or *unpublished* and those that are not published have been lying with the Manuscripts' Libraries in India and abroad. The situation is still worse in the case of the works of *Alaṅkāraśāstra* belonging to 18th and 19th centuries. A majority of these works are unpublished. They are in the Manuscripts' Libraries

and private collections. Of these works, both published and unpublished, there is no full and systematic study. However, Dr. S.K. De, Dr. P.V. Kane, and Sri. M. Krishnamachariar have given a brief survey and account of these works in their histories of poetics and literature.

The regional accounts of Sanskrit literature like those of Kerala by Dr. K. Kunjunni Raja, Āndhra by Dr. P. Sriramamurthy etc., contain some information about the *Alaṅkāra* works of these centuries. These sources are of great help to know the extent of *Alaṅkāra* literature of this period and to ascertain the dates of the authors. Some of the unpublished works deposited in the Manuscripts' libraries and private collections are not noticed in the above works. Information about them has to be gathered directly from those sources. All this is utilised for giving this account of the works and authors of *Alaṅkāra* during 18th and 19th centuries.

From these sources it has been possible to collect details of about 80-85 works belonging to Post-Jagannātha period (18th and 19th centuries). Of these about 30 works are printed and the rest are in manuscripts. Among these manuscripts, the authorship of about a dozen works is not known and the dates of these are tentatively fixed on the basis of internal evidence. Some of these manuscipts are incomplete and full of lacunae in the available portions. Thus the information about them

is incomplete. About 25 works deal with all the concepts and cover the entire field of Sanskrit Poetics. The rest of the works deal with one or two areas such as *Alaṅkāra, Rasa, Śabdavṛtti, Citrakāvya,* etc. A majority of these works deal with *Alaṅkāras* only. A large number of works of this period, whether dealing with all topics of *Alaṅkāraśāstra* or treating of only some topics, have been of the *Yaśobhūṣaṇa* type, glorifying in their illustrative stanzas either a patron (a king or an officer of a king) or a *Guru* or personal deity (*Iṣṭadevatā*). It is convenient to notice these works under the following heads:

I. Works dealing with all topics of poetics or dramaturgy or both.

II. Works dealing with some topics of poetics or dramaturgy.

I. Works dealing with all topics of poetics or dramaturgy or both

This brief account of the works and authors may be profitably started with one of the most representative works of this period, viz., *Nañjarājayaśobhūṣaṇa* of Narasiṁhakavi. It represents a type called *Yaśobhūṣaṇa* started by the well-known *Pratāparudrīya* of Vidyānātha. It is thus representative of this period, a majority of the works of which are of this type. It is also representative of the period in another respect, i.e., in respect of illustrating the various concepts of poetics with

stanzas composed by the very authors. Narasiṁhakavi has especially composed illustrative stanzas eulogising his patron, *Nañjarāja* as in *Pratāparudrayaśobhūṣaṇa*. Thus a brief account of the following works starting with *Nañjarājayaśobhūṣaṇa*, is first given.

1. *Nañjarājayaśobhūṣaṇa* of Narasiṁhakavi.
2. *Rāmavarmayaśobhūṣaṇa* of Sadāśiva Makhin
3. *Alaṅkāramañjarī* of Unkonwn authorship
4. *Kāvyakalānidhi* of Kṛṣṇasudhī
5. *Rasakalpadruma* of Caturbhuja
6. *Apparāyayaśascandrodaya* of Veṅkaṭa- śāstrin
7. *Sāhityakalpadruma* of Nārāyaṇa
8. *Sāhityakallolinī* of Bhaṣyakārācārya
9. *Sāhityacintāmani* of Cāvalī Rāmasudhī
10. *Sāhityakalpadruma* of Kollūri Rājaśekhara

1. Nañjarājayaśobhūṣaṇa of Narasiṁhakavi[1]

Nañjarājayaśobhūṣaṇa is an important work of the period. It is written on the model of *Pratāparudrayaśobhūṣaṇa* of Vidyānātha, as already pointed out. It covers the entire field of poetics and dramaturgy in seven chapters. The author, Narasiṁhakavi, was born in a family of *Sanagara* Brahmins and lived under the patronage of Kalale

---

1. Edited : E. Krishnamacharya, Oriental Institue, Baroda, 1930.

Nañjarāja, a *Sarvādhikarin* during the reign of Mummaḍi Kṛṣṇarāja Odeyar of Mysore in the first half of 18th century A.D. The topics of poetics and dramaturgy are the same as those found in *Pratāparudrīya*. The first chapter deals with the kinds and characteristics of heroes and heroines along with those of their associates in love-affairs. The second chapter is devoted to the definition of *Kāvya*, explanation of three *functions* of words, *Vṛttis*, three *Rītis, Śayyā, Pāka* and the classification of *Kāvya*. The third chapter gives the classification of *Dhvanikāvya, Guṇībhūtavyaṅgyakāvya* and the illustrations of the major varieties of *Dhvani* and the eight varieites of *Guṇībhūtāvyaṅgya*. The nature and number of *Rasas* along with the explanation of their accessories, accupy the fourth chapter. The fifth chapter deals with *Doṣas* and *Guṇas*. The lengthy sixth chapter contains the definitions of *Nṛtta, Nāṭya, Rūpaka,* etc., the characteristics of ten *Rūpakas*, five *sandhis* and Sixty-four *Sandhyaṅgas*, the characteristics and purposes of *Viṣkambhaka, Praveśaka, Cūlikā, Aṅkāsya, Aṅkāvatāra, Sūtradhāra, Nāndī,* etc. The latter portion of this chapter contains a drama composed by the author himself to illustrate all the technicalities of a Sanskrit drama. The seventh chapter deals with *Alaṅkāras* of both *śabda* and *artha*.

The author is largely indebted to Vidyānātha in the treatment of all these topics of poetics and dramaturgy. Yet he shows some originality. This

is particularly evident in his chapter on *Alaṅkāra*, where he often shows certain deviations from Vidyānātha and introduces more detailed discussions in the light of the later developments in the works of Appayyadīkṣita and Jagannātha. The illustrations are the author's own compositions in praise of his patron, Kalale Nañjarāja.

2. Rāmavarmayaśobhūṣaṇa of Sadāśiva Makhin[1]

Rāmavarmayaśobhūṣaṇa is another work of this period written on the model of *Pratāparudrīya* of Vidyānātha. The author, Sadaśiva Makhin, was the son of Mīnākṣī and Cokkanātha Adhvarin, probably the same as the author of a commentary on The *Yudhiṣṭhiravijaya* of Vāsudeva.[2] All the illustrative stanzas in the work are devoted to the glorification of the author's patron, Rāmavarma Kulaśekhara Vañcīpāla (Kārtīka Tirunāḷ) who ruled Travancore between 1758 and 1798 A.D.

This work is in nine chapters like *Pratāparudrīya*. The arrangement of the topics of poetics and dramaturgy is in the same order as in *Pratāparudrīya*. The author generally reproduces the rules, definitions the illustrative stanzas in praise of Rāmavarma Kulaśekhara. A model drama called *Vasulakṣmī-kalyāṇa* is embedded in the chapter on dramaturgy.

1. Travancore Archeological Series, V. 18.
2. A.S. Ramanatha Iyer's Article in Indian Antiquary, LIII, 1924, January, pp. 1- 8.

3. Alaṅkāramañjarī[1] of unknown authorship

Alaṅkāramañjarī of unkonwn authorship is also on the model of *Pratāparudrīya*. It consists in ten chapters covering the entire field of poetics and dramaturgy. The illustrations in this work are in praise of Rāmacandra, a Zamindar of Kākarlapūḍi in the Viśākhapaṭnam District in 18th Century.

4. Kāvyakalānidhi[2] of Kṛṣṇasudhī

Kṛṣṇasudhī, the author of *Kāvyakalānidhi* was the son of Śivarāma and a descendent of Jagannātha Paṇḍitarāja of *Upadeṣṭṛ* family. He lived in Uttara Merūr on the banks of the Seyyār near Kāñcī. *Kāvyakalānidhi* is another comprehensive work on poetics. It is in ten chapters called *Kusumas*. The topics are the same as those mentioned in the section on Nañjarājīya (No. 1). The illustrative stanzas are in prasie of the author's patron, king Ravivarman of Kolattanāḍ.

5. Rasakalpadrauma[3] of Caturbhuja

Rasakalpadruma is an interesting work written under the patronage of a Muslim ruler, Saistakhan, son of Asakakhan and grandson of Itamaddoula. Caturbhuja wrote this work to delight his partron, who was himself a poet in Sanskrit. The work is

---

1. Madras Govt. Oriental Library, MS. No. R. 2152.
2. Madras Govt. Oriental Library, MS. No. R. 2918 (Tr. in Volumes) Printed, Sri Rama Vilas Press, Madras, 1893.
3. Ulwar, 1067 : M.K. : H.C.S.L., P. 785.

in 65 *prastāvas* containing 1000 verses in all. The date of its composition is mentioned to be *Saṁvat* 1745 (i.e. 1689 A.D.). The work deals wth poetics and erotics, and mentions rare authors and works. Six stanzas of Saistakhan are quoted in the work.

6. Apparāyayaśaścandrodaya[1] of Aṇivilla Veṅkaṭaśāstrin

Veṅkaṭaśāstrin belonged to Āṇivilla family of Kākaraparti Agrahāram in West Godāvarī District. He was the son of Yajñanārāyaṇa. He was a great scholar in all *Śāstras* and was honoured by Gajapati Mahārāja of Peddāpura and Nīladri Mahārāja of Dārlapūḍi. He was also the donee of Vallurumalli Agrahāram presented in 1745 A.D. by Meka Veṅkaṭa Narasiṁha Appārāo, Zamindar of Nuzvīḍ. He was a good poet. *Māheśvaramahākāvya, Satīśataka, Bhāskarapraśasti* and *Rukmiṇīpariṇaya* are the poems composed by him. *Apparāyayaśaścandrodaya* is a work of the *Yaśobhūṣaṇa* type, with illustrative stanzas eulogising Narasiṁha Appārāo of Nuzvīḍ. The author has written two other works in the field of *Alaṅkāraśāstra*. They are *Alaṅkārasudhāsindhu* and *Rasaprapañca*. A brief account of these will be given later in this section (vide No. 38 & 61 respectively).

7. Sāhityakalpadruma[2] of Nārāyaṇa

Nārāyaṇa is the son of Āṇivilla Veṅkaṭaśāstrin noticed above. He wrote his *Sāhityakalpadruma* on

1. Printed : Sri Bhairava Press, Madras, 1915.
2. Printed Nuzvid.

the same model as of his father's work. The illustrative stanzas are in praise of the *Zamindar*, Jagannātha Appārāo of Nuzvīḍ.

8. Sāhityakallolinī[1] of Bhāṣyakārācārya

Sāhityakallolinī, like most of the works noticed above, embraces all topics of poetics and dramaturgy. The author, Bhāṣyakārācārya, was a descendent of Varadaguru of Śrīvatsagotra and lived at Śrī Perumbudūr (birth place of Śrī Rāmānujācārya), Chinglepet District, probably in 19th century A.D.[2] It is interesting to note that the author refers to some *Kṣudraprabandhas* in prose such as *Amṛtadhvani*, *Daṇḍakas*, etc., besides the *Kṣudraprabhandhas* in poetry.

9. Sāhityacintāmaṇi[3] of Cāvalī Rāmasudhī

Cāvalī Rāmasudhī or Rāmaśāstrin was the son of Yajñāmbā and Narasiṁha. He was a great *Ālaṅkārika* of 19th century A.D. He flourished in the courts of Gopālapuram, Pīṭhapuram, and Peddāpuram, all the three situated in the East Godāvarī district. He was honoured by Vijayagopāla of Gopālapuram, Sūryarāya of Pīṭhapuram (1885-1964 A.D.) and Veṅkata Siṁhādri

1. M.O.L. No. 8 D. 12964.
2. M.K. : H.C.S.L., P. 788.
3. Printed : Āndhra Sāhitya Pariṣat Patrikā, Vol. 52 Nos. 5,6; Vol. 53, Nos. 1,2,3,4,5,6; Vol. 54, Nos. 1,2,3,4,5; Vol. 55, Nos. 1-4,5,6,7; Vol. 57, Nos. 1,2,3,4,5,6.

Jagapatirāya of Peddāpuram or Koṭham. He wrote three works on *Alaṅkāraśāstra*. *Sāhityacintāmani*, one of the works, dealing with all the topics of poetics, glorifies in its illustrative stanzas king Sūryarāya of Pīṭhapuram. The text of this work serialised in the *Āndhra Sāhitya Pariṣad Patrikā*, has six chapters dealing with *Nāyaka* (1) *Kāvyasvarūpa*, *Kāvyabheda*, etc., (2) *Doṣa*, (3) *Guṇa*, (4) *Śabdālaṅkāra*, and (5) *Arthālaṇkāra*, (6) the sixth chapter is printed upto *Rūpakālaṅkāra*. It is not known whether the rest of the text is serialised in the subsequent issues of the *Patrikā*, which is said to have been discontinued probably from 1970 onwards.

The author closely follows Vidyānātha in the treatment of all the topics in *Sāhityacintāmaṇi*, as he does in his other works, *Alaṅkāramuktāvalī* and *Kuvalayāmoda*, a brief account of which will be given subsequently in this section (vide Nos. 42 & 43). Yet he shows his originality in the exposition of the various topics and elucidating the controversial points in the light of later developments in the *Śāstra*.

10. Sāhityakalpadruma[1] of Kollūri Rājaśekhara

Sāhityakalpadruma is a work on poetics and dramaturgy in 81 *stabakas* of which the first four are printed.[2] The author, Kollūri Rājaśekhara, who

1. M.O.L., No. R. 2126a.
2. M.K. : H.C.S.L., P. 788, f.n.1

calls himself also as Somaśekhara, was the son of the Veṅkateśa and lived in Perūru on the bank of the rivar Kauśikī in the Godāvarī Koṇasīmā about 1840 A.D. He was a *protege* of a Brahmin Chief called Rameśvara of Aṇipiṇḍivaṁśa of Mukteśvara, son of Viśveśvara and Kāmākṣī, who is called Ammaṇṇa Mahīmahendra. The author is credited with the authorship of *Āryāṅghripadmastuti, Śivaśataka, Śrīśacampū* and *Bhāgavatacampū*. He has written another work called *Alaṅkāramakaranda*. A brief account of this work will be presented later in this section (vide No. 45).

The entire manuscript of *Sāhityakalpadruma* in 81 *stabakas* could not be traced. The manuscript consulted here (i.e., M.O.L. No. 2126a) contains *stabakas* 5 to 8 only. The sixth chapter deals with minor types of *Kāvya (Kṣudraprabhandhas)* called *Jayaghoṣaṇā, Tyāgaghoṣaṇā, Bhogāvalī, Birudāvalī*, etc., with elabroate illustrations composed by the author himself in prasie of Lord Śrīkṛṣṇa.

All the ten works noticed above are of the *Yaśobhūṣaṅa* type, most of them dealing with all the topics of poetics and dramaturgy. Now a brief account of the other works of dealing with all the topics of *Aṅkāraśāstra*, is given. This account is started with a representative work of this period, viz., *Alaṅkāramaṇidarpaṇa* of Veṅkāmātya. It is noted above that *Nañjarājayaśobhūṣaṇa* of Narasiṁhakavi is a representative work in centain respects.

Alaṅkāramaṇidarpaṇa of Veṅkāmātya, which was also composed under the patronage of the erstwhile rulers of Mysore, is representative in another respect. It represents the spirit of scholarly discussion in projecting the views on the various concepts of poetics held from the earliest times down to 18th century A.D. Although it is not a regular *Yaśobhūṣaṇa* type of work, yet the illustrative stanzas are composed by the very author himself. Thus it is representative of the works of this period in this respect also. A brief account of the following works starting from *Alaṅkāramaṇidarpaṇa* is presented below:

11. *Alaṅkāramaṇidarpaṇa* of Veṅkāmātya
12. *Alaṅkārasāra* of Bālakṛṣṇabhaṭṭa
13. *Kāvyakaustubha* } of Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa
14. *Sāhityakaumudī* } of Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa
15. *Alaṅkārenduśekhara* of Nṛsiṁhācārya
16. *Kāvyenduprakāśa* of Kāmarāja Dīkṣita
17. *Kāvyāloka* of Hariprasāda
18. *Sāhityasāra* of Acyutarāya Moḍak
19. *Kāvyakaumudī* of Ratnabhūṣaṇa
20. *Alaṅkārasūtra* of Candrakānta Tarkālaṅkāra

21. *Alaṅkārasūtrāṇi*
22. *Mandāramarandacampū*
23. Kāvyanavanītam
24. *Kāvyalakṣaṇasaṅgraha*

} of Kṛṣṇāvadhūta Paṇḍita

25. *Śṛṅgārasāra*
26. *Śṛṅgārasārāvalī*

} of Veṅkaṭanārāyaṇa

11. Alaṅkāramaṇidarpaṇa[1] of Veṅkāmātya

Alaṅkāramaṇidarpaṇa of Veṅkāmātya is a voluminous work, the bulk of which is devoted to the elucidation of all the concepts of poetics with profuse quotations from various sources and illustrations drawn from the author's own poetic compositions. Veṅkāmātya was a younger contemporary of Nṛsiṁhakavi, the author of *Nañjarājīya,* whose definition of *Kāvya* is criticised by him. He was a minister of Hyder Ali Khan who ruled the erstwhile Kingdom of Mysore in the latter half of 18th century A.D. The work consists of six chapters. The topics of poetics are the same as those detailed in connection with *Nañjarāja-yaśobhūṣaṇa*. The discussion on the definition of *Kāvya* and the relative position of the cencepts of *Guṇa, Doṣa, Alaṅkāra, Vṛtti, Rīti, Śayyā* and *Pāka* in the general scheme of the *Dhvani* theory in the first chapter is very extensive. Same is true of the subsequent chapters dealing with *Dhvanikāvya,*

1. M.O.R.I., No. P. 2570.

Rasādidhvani, *Guṇībhūtavyaṅgya*, *Śabdālaṅkāras* and *Arthālaṅkāras* respectively.

The discussion is carried out on the various points evolving out of illustrations of the respective concepts. There is an impact of the well known controversy between Appayyadīkṣita and Jagannātha on his *Alaṅkāra* Chapter and the author often helps in the elucidation of the points made by them. In the majority of the instances he upholds Appayyadīkṣita's view-points.

It is interesting to note here that the author subjects the entire material to critical scrutiny and accepts nothing without proper examination in the light of his knowledge of not only poetics but also other *Śāstras* like *Nyāya* and *Mīmāṁsā* of which he was a master.

12. Alaṅkārasāra[1] of Bālakṛṣṇabhaṭṭa

Alaṅkārasāra belongs to the first decade of 18th century A.D. A manuscript of this work dated *Saṁvat* 1758 which corresponds to 1702 A.D. is available.

The author, Bālakṛṣṇabhaṭṭa, is styled Tighara. He was the son of Govardhanabhaṭṭa of Vallabha tradition. He quotes from both *Kuvalayānanda* and *Citramīmāṁsā* of Appayyadīkṣita. This is another

1. Descriptive Cat. of Oriental Library, Madras, No. 23 of 1881-82.

indication that his date cannot be earlier than 1650 A.D.

The work is in ten chapters called *Ullāsas* like Mammaṭa's *Kāvyaprakāśa*. The topics dealt with in this work are the same as those of *Kāvyaprakāśa*. There is a slight variation from *Kāvyaprakāśa* in the distribution of the topics in the second and third *Ullāsa*s. Mammaṭa deals with the varieties of *Śabda* and *Artha* in the second *Ullāsa*. Here he explains the two functions, *Abhidhā* and *Lakṣaṇā*, in full and deal with *Śābdī Vyañjanā*, leaving *Ārthī Vyañjanā* to be separately dealt with in the third chapter. But Bālakṛṣṇabhaṭṭa deals with *Śabdanirṇaya* in the second chapter and with *Arthanirṇaya* in the third, thus distributing the topics of Mammaṭa's second and third chapters equally in two chapters. The rest of the chapters agree in content with the corresponding chapters of *Kāvyaprakāśa*.

13. Kāvyakaustubha
14. Sāhityakaumudī } **of Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa**

The author of *Kāvyakaustubha* and *Sāhityakaumudī*, Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa, was a pupil of Rādhā Damodaradāsa (1710-60 A.D.) and Gopāla Dāsa and a Vaiṣṇava follower of Caitanya. He is said to have been a contemporary of Jayasiṁha, a ruler of Jayapur (beginning of 18th Cent. A.D.). Aufrecht[1] notes that one of his

1. Peterson's Reports IV CXIII, M.K. : HSCL, P. 786, F,n,7

works, a commentary on *Utkalikāvallarī*, was written in 1765 A.D. Baladeva was a great scholar in *Vedānta* and has earned great fame with over a dozen works on *Vedānta* of Caitanya that has a leaning towards the *Mādhvasaṁpradāya* of South India. In the field of *Alaṅkāraśāstra* he has contributed a work of his own called *Kāvyakaustubha* and a commentary called *Sāhityakaumudī*[1] on the *Kārikās* of *Kāvyaprakāśa*. It is this Baladeva who like Maheśvara, created a controversy over the authorship of the *Kārikās* of *Kāvyaprakāśa*. He held the opinion that the *Kārikās* in *Kāvyaprakāśa* were written by *Bharata* and that Mammaṭa was only the author of the *Vṛtti* on those *Kārikās*. However, this theory has been now rejected by a majority of scholars.

Kāvyakaustubha[2] is a work covering all topics of poetics in nine chapters. The topics in this work are the same as those of *Kāvyaprakāśa*. There is difference only in the distribution of the topics from the second chapter onwards. *Rasādidhvani* occupies the third chapter. The topics of *Guṇa*, *Rīti* and *Doṣa* are taken up in the next three chapters, while these topics come in the later chapters of *Kāvyaprakāśa*. The classification of *Dhvani* and *Guṇībhūtavyaṅgya* are treated in the seventh and eighth chapters respectively. The contents of the ninth and tenth chapters of *Kāvyaprakāśa*, i.e.,

---

1. Published, Kavyamala, Bombay, 63, 1897.
2. Ed. Haridas Das, Navadvip, Bengal. 1957.

Śabdālaṅkāras and *Arthālaṅkāras*, are included in the single chapter, which is the ninth and last chapter in this work.

15. Alaṅkārenduśekhara[1] of Narasiṁhācārya

Narasiṁhācārya was the son of the Dāsamācārya of *Śriśaila* family. He wrote a commentary on a work on music called *Śānta-vilāsa* of Subrahmaṇyasudhī (Hariśāba Kavīndra) and a campū called Jānakīpariṇaya. *Alaṅkārenduśekhara* is a treatise on *Alaṅkāraśāstra* dealing in five chapters with *Nāyakalakṣaṇa*, *Kāvyasvarūpa*, *Rasalakṣaṇa*, *Doṣa*, *Guṇa* and *Alaṅkāra*. This work is generally based on *Pratāparudrīya*.

16. Kāvyenduprakāśa[2] of Kāmarāja Dīkṣita

Kāvyenduprakāśa deals with all topics of poetics in 15 chapters called *Ullāsas* or *Kalās*. A manuscript of this work contains 16 chapters. Another manuscript deposited in BORI (D.XII.142) contains only the 14th and 15th chapters.[3] This BORI manuscript has been the basis of the text published by the Chaukhamba series, Benaras. The Author, Kāmarāja or Kāmarūpaśāstrin, was the son of Samarājadīkṣita, the author of *Śṛṅgārāmṛtalaharī* (Ed. Bombay). He was the father of Vrajarāja, whose son Jīvarāja was the author of *Rasataraṅgiṇīsetu*.

---

1. M.O.L. No. D, 12978, I Chap. only S.K. De. S.P. Vol. I P. 286-87.
2. Choukhambha Series 100, 1966, Bombay Kāvyamālā.
3. New Cat. Cat. Madras, Vol. III, P. 356.

Jīvarāja says that his grand father Samarāja obtained the name of Kāmarāja and was the author of *Kāvyenduprakāśa, Rasanirṇaya, Nṛsiṁhavijaya,*[1] etc. It is not possible to understand whether Jīvarāja has been referring to his great-grand-father Samarāja or Kāmarāja as the author of this work.

17. Kāvyāloka[2] of Hariprasāda

Hariprasāda Māthura, the author of *Kāvyāloka*, was the son of Gaṅgeśamiśra Māthura. This Gaṅgeśamiśra was the teacher of Sukhalāla, the author of *Alaṅkāramañjari*, who will be noticed later in this section (vide No. 30). Hariprasāda is also the author of a work on *Ācāra* called *Māsādinirūpaṇa* and another work on *Alaṅkārasāstra* called *Kāvyārthagumpha*.[3] This work is dated *saṁvat* 1775 (i.e. 1719 A.D.). *Kāvyāloka* is a work in seven *prakāśas* and is dated *Saṁvat* 1784 (i.e. 1728 A.D.).

18. Sāhityasāra[4] of Acyutarāya Moḍak

Sāhityasāra is an extensive work in twelve chapters called *Ratnas*. The author, Acyutarāya Moḍak, was the son of Nārāyaṇa and Annapūrṇā. He was a great scholar in *Advaita Vedānta* and other *Śāstras*. He refers with great reverence to his teachers in Vedānta, Ṣaṣṭhī Nārāyaṇa and

---

1. M.K. H.S.C.L. P. 785, f,n,l.
2. Aufrecht, i. 103a; S.K. De. : S.P., I.P. 314
3. Aufrecht ii. 20b; S.K. De. : S.P., I.P. 314.
4. Ed. Nirnayasagar, Bombay, 1906.

Saccidānanda Sarasvatī. He was a poet and critic of great merit. He also mentions other teachers, Mahādeva (who initiated him into *Śivabhakti*) and Raghūttamācārya. He is credited with the authorship of 27 works besides *Sāhityasāra*. This work with his own commentary, *Sarasāmoda*, was completed at Nāsik (Pañcavaṭī) in *Śaka* year 1753 which corresponds to 1831 A.D.

The work starts with a definition of *Kāvya* in the first chapter and ends with a conclusion *(Upasaṁhāra)* giving a gist of the contents of the whole work in the twelfth chapter. The rest of the chapters present a detailed discussion on *Śabdavyāpāras, Dhvanikāvya, Guṇībhūtavyaṅgyakāvya, Citrakāvya, Doṣa, Guṇa, Arthālaṅkāra, Śabdālaṅkāra, Nāyaka-Nayikābheda,* thus covering all the topics of Sanskrit poetics within the framework of the *Dhvani* theory. The text of the work, *Kārikās* and illustrations, are in *Śloka* metre. There is no prose *Vṛtti* within the body of the text. However, the commentary written by the author himself, i.e., *Sarasāmoda* serves more than the purpose of a usual *Vṛtti.* It contains profuse quotations from earlier works from Bharata to Jagannātha and provides the background for each view expressed and the new points made. This commentary is indispensable for the clear understanding of the author's views.

19. Kāvyakaumudī[1] of Ratnabhūṣaṇa

Kāvyakaumudī is a work of East Bengal belonging to 19th century A.D. The author, Ratnabhūṣaṇa is said to hailed from a *Vaidya* family in East Bengal.[2] This work is in ten *paricchedas* dealing respectively with *Nāma, Liṅga, Dhātupratyaya, Kāvyalakṣaṇa, Dhvani, Guṇībhūtavyaṅgya, Guṇas, Śabdālaṅkāras, Arthālaṅkāras* and *Doṣaṣ*. In Haraprasāda Śāstri's Notices of Sanskrit Manuscripts, the manuscript II.35 is dated 1809 A.D.[3] Thus the work should be taken as belonging to the first decade of 19th century A.D.

20. Alaṅkārasūtra[4] of Candrakānta Tarkālaṅkāra

Alaṅkārasūtra is a work dealing with the topics of poetics in *Sūtras*. The author, Candrakanta Tarkalankara was a Bengali Paṇḍit who wrote this work at the end of the 19th century A.D.

21. Alaṅkārasūtrāṇi[5]
22. Mandāramarandacampū[6]
23. Kāvyanavanītam[7]
24. Kāvyalakṣaṇasaṅgraha

} of Kṛṣṇāvadhūta Paṇḍita

1. H.R. 1905, II-Vii and No. 35, H.P.N. II 35
2. S.K. De. S.P. I. P. 295.
3. N.C.C. IV P. 87
4. S.K. De. S.P. I. P. 319.
5. K.T.P. : V. S.Ms. L., D.C. No. 689.
6. Printed, Nirnayasagar, 1895.
7. M.O.L. No. R. 5723.

Kṛṣṇāvardhūta paṇḍita was a poet, critic and author in several *Śāstras* like *Vyākaraṇa*, *Nyāya* and *Vedānta*. He was the son of Veṅkaṭa and Triveṇī of Nārāyaṇadevarakere (Bellary District, Karnataka), now submerged under the *Tuṅgabhadrā* project. He was born in 1835 A.D. (*Śaka* 1757) and died 1909 A.D. He studied at Mysore and acquired scholarship in all branches of Sanskrit learning.[1] He has contributed four works to *Alaṅkāraśāstra*, viz., *Alaṅkārasūtrāṇi*, *Mandāramarandacampū*, *Kāvyanavanītam*, *Kāvyalakṣaṇasaṅgraha*.

Alaṅkārasūtrāṇi or *Sārasvatālaṅkāra-sūtra*[2] is in five chapters each divided into four sections called *pādas*. It covers the entire field of poetics, dramaturgy and *Kaviśikṣā*. The first chapter, in particular, gives the classification of *Padārthas* on the lines of *Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika* School and introduces suitable alterations and additions to accomodate some of the concepts of *Alaṅkāraśāstra*. The author has himself written a commentary on this work called *Alaṅkārasūtrabhāṣya*.[3] Another name of this commentary is *Camatkāracāmīkara*. This is also clear from a

---

1. Biographical details : Prof. K.T. Pandurangi : Introduction to the Author's *Advaitanavanītam* published in Journal of the Karnatak University, Humanities, Vol. I., No.2, June 1957, pp. 127-129.
2. This work is critically edited by the present writer and is awaiting publication.
3. This commentary is deposited in Prof. K.T. Pandurangi's V.S. Ms. L. Des. Cat. No. 690.

manuscript deposited in Madras Government Oriental Library.[1]

Mandāramarandacampū, though called a *campū*, is actually a work on prosody, dramaturgy, poetics and *Kaviśikṣā*. It consists of eleven chapters called *Bindus* dealing respectively-with (1) *Chandas*, (2) Description of *Nāyaka*, etc., (3) *Śleṣa*, (4) *Yamaka* and *Citra*, (5) *Bandha*, (6) Enigmatology, (7) Dramaturgy, (8) Characteristics of hero, etc. (9) *Bhāva and Rasa*, (10) *Alaṅkāra* and *Dhvani*, (11) *Doṣa, Pāka, Kāvyabheda, Kaviśikṣā*, etc. This work is an encyclopaedia of poetics and dramaturgy. The topics lack proper arrangement. This can be ignored in view of the valuable material the work contains.

Kāvyanavanītam, like the author's works *Advaitanavanītam*, *Tarkanavanītam*, etc., in other *Śāstras*, is a digest of the concepts of *Alaṅkāraśāstra*. *Kāvyalakṣaṇasaṅgraha*[2] is a collection of the definitions of *Kāvya* in general, *Dhvanibheda*, *Guṇībhūtavyaṅgyabheda*, *Citrabheda*, etc., with appropriate illustrations most of which are the author's compositions.

---

1. No. R. 5726, full title *Camatkāracāmīkaraḥ. Alaṅkārasūtrabhāṣyam*.
2. Prof. K.T. Pandurangi. V.S. Ms. L.; M.O.L. No. R. 5725.

25. Śṛṅgārasāra[1] } **of Veṅkaṭanārāyaṇa**
26. Śṛṅgārasārāvalī[2]

Veṅkaṭanārāyaṇa was the son of Lakṣmī and Kāmeśvara dīkṣita of Goḍavarti family. He claims to have written works in *eight* languages. *Śṛṅgārasāra* is a work in six *ullāsas* dealing with all topics of poetics and dramaturgy. *Śṛṅgārasārāvalī* is another work of the author written earlier to the composition of *Śṛṅgārasāra*. In the reference to this work in his *Śṛṅgārasāra,* the author says that this more elaborate work deals mainly with dramaturgy.

II. Works dealing with some topics of poetics or dramaturgy

Works dealing with some topics of *Alaṅkāraśāstra* form the majority among the works of 18th and 19th centuries. In this group again, works dealing with *Alaṅkāras* only constitute the majority. Hence an account of these works is first given in the order given below:

27. Alaṅkārakaustubha }
28. Alaṅkāramuktāvalī } *of Viśveśvara Paṇḍita*
29. Alaṅkārapradīpa }
30. Alaṅkāramañjarī *of Sukhalālamiśra*
31. Sadalaṅkārasaṅgraha *of Śrīnivāsārya*
32. Alaṅkāradarpaṇa *of Unknown authorship*

1. M.O.L. No. D. 12958.
2. This work is referred to in *Śṛṅgārasāra*.

33. *Alaṅkāramañjūṣā*	of	*Devaśaṅkara purohita*
34. *Śaṭhavairivaibhava-prabhākara*	of	*Narasiṁha*
35. *Śrīśāhabhūpālaṅkāra*	of	*Lakṣmaṇakavi*
36. *Alaṅkārakaustubha*	of	*Kalyāṅa Subrahmaṇya*
37. *Alaṅkāramīmāṁsā*	of	*Śāntalūri Kṛṣṇasūri*
38. *Alaṅkārasudhāsindu*	of	*Veṅkaṭaśāstrin*
39. *Utprekṣāmañjarī*	of	*Varadārya*
40. *Alaṅkāraprakāśikā*	of	*Unknown authorship*
41. *Alaṅkāramuktāvalī*	of	*Kṛṣṇācārya*
42. *Alaṅkāramuktāvalī* 43. *Kuvalāyamoda*	of	*Cāvalī Rāmasudhī*
44. *Alaṅkārakaustubha*	of	*Kirīṭi Veṅkaṭācārya*
45. *Alaṅkāramakaranda*	of	*Kollūri Rājaśekhara*
46. *Kṛṣṇabhūpālīya*	of	*Garalapurīśaśāstrin*
47. *Alaṅkāramaṇihāra*	of	*Śrīkṛṣṇa Parakālayati*
48. *Guṇaratnahāra*	of	*Narasiṁha*
49. *Kāvyavilāsa*	of	*Cirañjīva Bhaṭṭācārya*
50. *Alaṅkāraśāstravilāsa*	of	*Rāmasubrahmaṇya-Śāstrin*

27. Alaṅkārakaustubha
28. Alaṅkāramuktāvalī } **of Viśveśvara Paṇḍita**
29. Alaṅkārapradīpa

Viśveśvara Paṇḍita hailed from *Pāṭiyā* five miles from Almoḍ in the *Himālayan* ranges. Hence he is called *Parvatīya*. He was the son of Lakṣmīdhara, who was himself his teacher. He was a great scholar, poet and critic. His poetical compositions have a wide range in form and content. He has written five works in the field of *Alaṅkāraśāstra*. *Alaṅkārakaustubha*,[1] *Alaṅkāramuktāvalī*,[2] *Alaṅkārapradīpa*,[3] *Rasacandrikā* and *Kavīndrakarṇābharaṇa*. Here the first three works deal exclusively with *Alaṅkāras* and are noticed here. The other two will be noticed in a subsequent portion of this section (Vide Nos. 53 and 73 respectively).

Alaṅkārakaustubha is a scholarly work dealing with sixty-one *Arthālaṅkāras*, thus agreeing in number and order with those in *Kāvyaprakāśa*. *Alaṅkāras* other than these sixty-one, which were defined and illustrated by his time, are accomodated within the scope of these sixty-one. The most important feature of this work is the employment of the dialectical method of *Navyanyāya* for the *Pariṣkāra* of *Alaṅkāras*. The second feature

1. Ed. Kavyamala, 66, 1898.
2. Chowkhambha Skt. Series, 1927.
3. Chowkhambha Skt. Series.

of the work lies in the mention of the points of controversy between Appayyadīkṣita and Jagannātha and a review and elucidation of the same. The author normally supports Appayyadīkṣita's stand.

Alaṅkāramuktāvalī, the second work of Viśveśvara, is practically a simplified version of his *Alaṅkāra-Kaustubha*. It deals with the same number of *Alaṅkāras* and refers to other *Alaṅkāras* of Neo-*Ālaṅkārikas* without any comment. The *Kārikās* defining the *Alaṅkāras* are taken from *Alaṅkāra-Kaustubha*.

Alaṅkārapradīpa is a simple manual of *Alaṅkāras* probably written by Viśveśvara prior to his other two works. The author deals with 121 *Arthālaṅkāras* from *Upamā* to *Rasādi-alaṅkāras*. Thus he treats of all the *Alaṅkāras* defined and illustrated in *Kuvalayānanda*. It seems most likely that the author prepared this simple manual and later took up the composition of *Alaṅkārakaustubha* and *Alaṅkāra-muktāvalī* to express his own view in respect of the nature and number of *Alaṅkāras*.

With the study of the *three* works of Viśveśvara, it is realised that they form a bridge between the tradition of Mammaṭa and that of the Neo-*Ālaṅkārikas*. The other works on *Alaṅkāra* do not go back to the number 61 of Mammaṭa, but proceed to follow Neo-*Ālaṅkārikas* such as Appayyadīkṣita and Jagannātha.

30. Alaṅkāramañjarī[1] of Sukhalālamiśra

Sukhalālamiśra was the son of Bāburāya and grandson of Hṛdayārāma. He was a pupil of Gaṅgeśa Miśra. His sixth ancestor, Damodara, was a minister of Vairamaputra at *Kāśī*. His other work, *Śṛṅgāramālā*,[2] was written in *Saṁvat* 1801 (i.e. 1745 A.D.). *Alaṅkāramañjarī* deals with Alaṅkāras following the Kārikās of Jayadeva.

31. Sadalaṅkārasaṅgraha[3] of Śrīnivāsārya

Sadalaṅkārasaṅgraha is available in an incomplete manuscript. The author, Śrīnivāsācārya, follows *Kuvalayānanda* of Appayyadīkṣita very colsely. He quotes from various authorities from Mammaṭa to Vaidyanātha Tatsat, the author of *Candrikā* on *Kuvalayānanda*. The work, as far as the available manuscript goes, deals with *Arthālaṅkāras* from *Upamā* to *Unmīlita* in the same order in which they are found in *Kuvalayānanda*. An important feature of this work is the use of *Mīmāṁsā Nyāyas* for determining the distinct characteristic of certain *Alaṅkāras* and the grounds for the differentiation of the same from others.

---

1. Aufrecht's Florentine Skt. Mss., 213; S.K. De, S.P. Vol. I, P. 312.
2. Ulwar Cat. No. 1083 (a Kāvya)
3. M.O.R.I. No. 625.

32. Alaṅkāradarpaṇa[1] of Unknown Authorship

Alaṅkāradarpaṇa of unknown authorship is also available in an incomplete manuscript containing the treatment of *Arthālaṅkāras* from *Upamā* to *Virodhābhāsa*. The main feature of the work is that the illustrative stanzas are in praise of either *Guha* or *Gajānana* and that they are full of suggestion. The author analyses his own stanzas to point out the element of suggestion contained in them.

33. Alaṅkāramañjūṣā[2] of Devaśaṅkara

Alaṅkāramañjūṣā is an interesting work dealing with *Arthālaṅkāras* only. The author, Devaśaṅkara Purohita, was the son of Nāhanābhāyi. He glorifies in his work the achievements of the Peshwa rulers of Poona, Raghunātha Rāo, Mādhava Rāo I, and Nārāyaṇa Rāo, who flourished in the later half of the 18th century A.D.

This work deals with 102 *Arthālaṅkāras* almost in the same order in which the first *100 Alaṅkāras* are treated in *Kuvalayānanda*. Although he follows *Kuvalayānanda* to a large extent, he shows certain deviations from the opinions of *Appayyadīkṣita*. He also refers to Jagannātha and reviews his criticism of *Kuvalayānanada* and *Citramīmāṁsā*, often taking the side of Appayyadīkṣita.

---

1. O.R.I., Mysore, No. P. 4039 & B. 748.
2. Scindia Oriental Series, 1, Ujjain, 1940.

34. Śaṭhavairivaibhavaprabhākara[1] of Mariṅgaṇṭī Narasiṁha

Śaṭhavairivaibhavaprabhākara is a manual of *Arthālaṅkāras* glorifying *Śaṭhvairi* or Nammālvār. *Narasiṁha* (Nṛsiṁha), the author of this work, belonged to a family of teachers surnamed *Mariṅgaṇṭī*. The long geneolgy of his family given at the beginning of the work goes back to the times of Śrī Rāmānujācārya. He was removed by generations from Sādhu Bhaṭṭāraka, who was a contemporary of Śrī Rāmānujācārya. Further the work reveals that he has been deeply indebted to Appayyadīkṣita. This enables us to assign him to the beginning of 18th century A.D. The work, as far as the available incomplete manuscript goes, deals with *Arthālaṅkars* from *Upamā* to *Udātta* in the same order in which they are found in *Kuvalayānanda*. He shows some deviations from Appayyadīkṣita in the conception of certain *Alaṅkāras*.

35. Śrīśāhabhūpālaṅkāra[2] of Lakṣmaṇakavi

Śrīśāhabhūpālaṅkāra mainly deals with *Śabdālaṅkāras* and *Arthālaṅkāras* after giving some details about the general topics of poetics such as *Kāvyaprayojana*, *Kāvyalakṣaṇa* and *Kāvyabheda*. The author, Lakṣmaṇakavi, was the son of Viśveśvara

1. M.O.R.I., No. B. 781. The present author has prepared an edition.
2. M.O.R.I., No. A. 143.

and Bhavānī of Benares and lived in the court of Śāhajī, one of the famous Marāṭha kings of Tanjore (1684-1711 A.D.). The work consists of two sections. The first section deals with the general topics of poetics. The second and major section treats of three *Śabdālaṅkāras* and 110 *Arthālaṅkāras*. The *Arthālaṅkāras* are the same as those in *Kuvalayānanda* common to both Appayyadīkṣita and Jagannātha, the author closely follows Jagannātha in their conception and classification. The main feature of this work lies in the restatement and elucidation of the controversial points between Appayyadīkṣita and Jagannātha. On all these points he follows the stand of Jagannātha as he does in the case of the definition and classification of *Kāvya* in the first section. He also quotes Vāmana's *sūtras* in the name of *Maṅkhusūtras* in both the sections. All the illustrative stanzas are in praise of his patron, Śrīśāhajī.

36. Alaṅkārakaustubha[1] of Kalyāṇa Subrahmaṇya

Alaṅkārakaustubha deals with *Arthālaṅkāras* only. The author, Kalyāṇa Subrahmaṇya, was the son of Subrahmaṇya and grandson of Gopāla of Perūru family. He was a *protege* of Bālarāmavarman, the Mahārāja of Travancore (1758-1798 A.D.). Since troublesome times followed the death of his patron, the author went over to Crangaiiore and lived under the patronage of Cranaganore *Rājas* till peace

1. M.O.L. No. 12790.

returned to Travancore. Invited back to Travancore, he spent his remaining years under the patronage of *Rāṇī* Lakṣmī. The illustrative stanzas in the work are in praise of Rāmavarman or his family deity, Śrī Padmanābha.

37. Alaṅkāramīmāṁsā[1] of Śāntalūri Kṛṣṇasūri

The author of *Alaṅkāramīmāṁsā*, Kṛṣṇasūri, is the same as the author of *Sāhityakalpalatikā* which will be noticed later (No. 83). He was the son of Gopālācārya at Taṇuku in the West Godāvarī District. He was born in 1770 A.D. He is the author of *Hayagrīvastava*,[2] *Strīpunarvivāhakaraṇanirasana* and *Nandīnirṇaya* (Medicine). *Alaṅkāramīmāṁsā* is a work on *Alaṅkāras*. The author criticises the views expressed in Rasagaṅgādhara.

38. Alaṅkārasudhāsindhu[3] of Veṅkaṭaśāstrin

Veṅkaṭaśāstrin, the author of this work, is the same as author of *Apparāyayasaścandrodaya* (No. 6 above) and *Rasaprapañca* (No. 61 later). This work deals with *Alaṅkāras* only.

39. Utprekṣāmañjarī[4] of Varadārya

Utprekṣāmañjarī deals with one *Alaṅkāra* only, i.e., *Utprekṣā*. The definition of *Utprekṣā* is a

---

1. M.K. : H.C.S.L., P. 783.
2. Mentioned in the third chapter of *Sāhityakalpalatikā*.
3. M.K. : H.C.S.L., P. 806.
4. M.O.R.I., No. P. 2023.

versified form of Appayyadīkṣita's *Vṛtti* under the *Utprekṣākārikā* in *Kuvalayānanda*. Further the author quotes the illustrations of *Hetūtprekṣā* and *Phalotprekṣā* and the definition of *Akṣepālaṅkāra* from *Kuvalayānanda*.[1] The illustrations noted here are not found in *Candrāloka*, nor is the terminalogy of the definition of *Ākṣepa* as quoted here. Hence it is possible to assume that the author belonged to the end of 17th century and the beginning of 18th century A.D. The lower limit of his date cannot, however, be decided with any degree of certainity.

The work gives 104 verieties of *Utprekṣā* as worked out by Vidyānātha, the indebtedness to whom the author admits. Among these varieties, 56 are *Vacyotprekṣā* varieties and 48 are *Gamyotprekṣā* varieties. The author illustrates the 56 *vācya* varieties with stanzas (all in *Anuṣṭubh* metre) in praise of Goddess Lakṣmī.

40. Alaṅkāraprakāśikā[2] of Unknown Authorship

Alaṅkāraprakāśikā is a compendium of *Śabdālaṅkāras* only. The author of this work is unknown. The date of the work cannot be ascertained. It may be surmised to be a work of 18th or 19th century A.D. on the basis of the numbering of the manuscript as D. in the Madras Oriental Library.

---

1. Kuval., Ka. 34, 35 and 73.
2. M.O.L. No. D, 12791

41. Alaṅkāramuktāvalī[1] of Kṛṣṇācārya

Alaṅkāramuktāvalī or *Satyasandhālaṅkāra* is a short and simple compendium of *Arthālaṅkāras*. The author, Kṛṣṇācārya, was the son of Rāmācarya, a great scholar in *Śāstras*. It is possible to surmise that he belonged to the close of 18th century and the beginning the 19th century A.D., since his preceptor, Śrī Satyasandhatīrtha, glorifying whom this work is written, was a pontiff of the Uttarādimaṭha from 1783 to 1784 A.D. The praise of the author's preceptor in the illustrative stanzas, imparts a devotional colour to the work. The work deals with *Arthālaṅkāras* from *Upamā* to *Hetu* (100) in the same order in which they are found in *Kuvalayānanda*. Regarding to conception of the *Alaṅkāra*, the author is indebted to Appayyadīkṣita. The work has an interesting discussion of the definition on *Alaṅkāra*.

42. Alaṅkāramuktāvalī[2] } of Cāvalī Rāmasudhī
43. Kuvalayāmoda[3]

The author of these works, Cāvalī Rāmasudhī, is the same as the author of *Sāhityacintāmaṇi*, a brief account of which is already given above (No. 9). These works, *Alaṅkāramuktāvalī* and *Kuvalayāmoda*, deal with *Alaṅkāras* of *Śabda* and

1. Ed. Satyadhyānavidyāpīṭha, Belgaum.
2. Ed., Arṣa Press, Vizagapatnam, 1897.
3. Contribution of Andhra to Skt. Lit., P.132.

Artha. *Alaṅkāramuktāvalī*, which is otherwise called *Vijayagopālayaśobhūṣaṇa*, eulogises in its illustrative stanzas, king Vijayagopāla of Gopālapuram. *Kuvalayāmoda* contains illustrative stanzas in praise of king Veṅkaṭa Siṁhadri Jagapatirāya of Peddapuram or Koṭham. The author closely follows Vidyānātha both in the conception and classification of *Alaṅkāras*. He shows some deviations from him also. Here he seems to have been influenced by Narasiṁha's *Nañjarājayaśobhūṣaṇa* (No. 1).

44. Alaṅkārakaustubha[1] of Kirīṭi Veṅkaṭācārya

Alaṅkārakaustubha is one of the compendiums of *Alaṅkāras* bearing this name. It is modelled on *Kuvalayānanda*. The author, *Kirīṭi Veṅkaṭācārya*, hailed from *Surpur* (Guhapura) of Karnataka. He belonged to the illustrious family of *Śrīvaiṣṇava* scholars called *Tirumala Bukkapaṭṭana Śaṭhamarṣaṇa Kula*, also called *Śrīśaila* family. He was the son of Aṇṇayārya and the preceptor of Veṅkaṭanāyaka (1773-1802 A.D.), the son of Pāmibhūpāla. The illustrative stanzas in the work are in praise of Veṅkaṭanāyaka, his patron. The work has two chapters, the first dealing with 6 *Śabdālaṅkāras* and the second treating of 108 *Arthālaṅkāras*. He is different from the author of *Rasacandrikā*, an account of which will be given later (No. 66).

---

1. N.C.C., I. P. 292-93

45. Alaṅkāramakaranda[1] of Kollūri Rājaśekhara

Alaṅkāramakaranda is another work of Kollūri Rājaśekhara, the author of *Sāhityakalpadruma* noticed above (No.10). This work is a compendium of *Alaṅkāras*, with illustrative stanzas in praise of the author's royal patron, Rāmeśvara of Āṇipiṇḍi-vaṁśa, also called Ammaṇṇa Mahīmahendra of Mukteśvar near *Godāvarī*.

46. Kṛṣṇabhūpālīya[2] of Sosale Garalapurīśaśāstrin

Śrīkṛṣṇabhūpālīya is a short and simple treatise on *Arthālaṅkāras* and *Śabdālaṅkāras*. Its author, Garalapurīśaśāstrin, who calls himself as *Śrīpurīśasudhī*, hails from Sosale near Tirumalakūḍu Narasīpur (in Mysore District). He was a court poet of Mummaḍi Kṛṣṇarāja Odeyar of Mysore (1799-1868 A.D.). The work deals with 100 *Arthālaṅkāras* and 6 *Śabdālaṅkāras*. The author closely follows Appayyadīkṣita in his conception of *Arthālaṅkāras*, while he is indebted to Vidyānātha for the conception of *Śabdālaṅkāras*.

The definitions are all given in *Sūtra* form, followed by a *Vṛtti*. The illustrations are in praise of the royal patron, Mummaḍi Kṛṣṇarāja Odeyar and are composed by the author himself.

---

1. Kuppuswami Shastri's Report I; M.O.L., No. R.2285 transferred to Tirupati.
2. Edited by the author's son Sosale Ayyāśāstrin, Govt. Press, Mysore, 1931

47. Alaṅkāramaṇihāra[1] of Śrī Kṛṣṇa Parakālayati

Alaṅkāramaṇihāra is a scholarly work dealing with *Arthālaṅkaras*. The author, Śrīkṛṣṇa Brahmatantra Parakālayati, was the Pontiff of the Parakālamaṭha at Mysore. He informs in his work that Navadurga (Hosadurga) *Tatadeśika* and Kṛṣṇāmbā were his parents and that he belonged to the Śrīśaila family. He was a poet of great merit as evident from the illustrative stanzas dedicated to Śrīnivāsa. This is a very important work on *Alaṅkāras*, since it presents a comprehensive view of the concepts underlying the *Alaṅkāras* and their varieties, summarising the views of all writers from Daṇḍin to Jagannātha. The controversial points between Appayyadīkṣita and Jagannātha are explained and on some points he expresses his own critical views.

48. Guṇaratnahāra[2] of Narasiṁha

Guṇaratnahāra is a compendium of 100 *Arthālaṅkāras*. Narasiṁha, the author, flourished in the court of Serfoji (Śarabhoji II or Śarabhanarapati), King of Tanjore, whose rule extended from 1800 to 1832 A.D.[3] The author takes the definitions from *Candrāloka* and illustrates them

---

1. Edited and Published in 4 Volumes : O.R.I., Mysore, (1917-29).
2. Tanjore Cat. IX No. 5207, P. 4028
3. Contribution of Andhra to Sanskrit Literature: Dr. P. Sriramamurti, P. 173.

with stanzas in praise of Serfoji II. The descriptive catalogue of Tanjore, however, notes that Narasiṁha was a *protege* of Serfoji I (=1712-27 A.D.), son of Śāhajī.

These are the works dealing with *Alaṅkaras* only. *Kāvyavilāsa* of Rāma Cirañjīva Bhaṭṭācārya, belonging to 18th century A.D. deals with *Alaṅkāras* and *Rasa* and *Alaṅkāraśāstravilāsa* of Rāmasubrahmaṇya Śāstrin belonging to 19th century A.D. deals with *Dhvani* and *Alaṅkāras*.

49. Kāvyavilāsa[1] of Cirañjīva Bhaṭṭācārya

Kāvyavilāsa is a short and lucid treatise on *Rasa* and *Alaṅkāras*. The author, Rāma Cirañjīva Bhaṭṭācārya, was the son of Rāghavendra, who was a contemporary of *Kṛpārāma*, a great scholar favoured by emperors Jahangir and Shah Jahan (Middle of 17th Century A.D.). Cirañjīva wrote one of his other works called *Vṛttaratnāvalī* with illustrative stanzas in praise of Yaśavantasiṁha, Naib Divān of Dacca under Sujauddaulah of Bengal (1653-1731 A.D.). Thus the literary career of the author belongs to the end of 17th century and the beginning of 18th century A.D. He is also the author of *Vidvanmodataraṅgiṇī*, *Mādhavacampū*, *Hṛdayakalpalatā*, *Śivastotra and Śṛṅgāratatiṇī*.

Kāvyavilāsa has two chapters called *Bhaṅgīs*, the first giving a lucid exposition of *Kāvyasvarūpa*

1. Ed. Sarasvati Bhavan, Benares, No. 16, 1925

and *Rasa* and the second treating of 89 *Arthālaṅkāras* and 4 *Śabdālaṅkāras*. The illustrative stanzas are taken from the author's poetical compositions mentioned above. Some illustrative stanzas are in praise of *Yaśavantasiṁha* and other chiefs of his family.

50. Alaṅkāraśāstravilāsa[1] of Rāma Subrahmaṇya Śāstrin

Rāma Subrahmaṇyaśāstrin (Rāmasubbāśāstrin) was the son of Rāmaśaṅkara, grandson of Aśvatthanārāyaṇa and disciple of Śivarāma. He lived at Tiruvasanallūr, Tanjore District. He was born by about 1807 A.D. and died in 1922 A.D. He was a great scholar in *Śāstras* and wrote works on *Śāstras* and commentaries on *Upaniṣads*.

Alaṅkāraśāstravilāsa has two *prakaraṇas*, the first deaing with *Kāvyalakṣaṇa, Kāvyabheda, Dhvani* and *Rasa* and the second with *Arthālaṅkāras*. Like Lakṣmaṇasūri, the author of *Śrīśāhabhūpālaṅkāra* (No. 35 above), Rāma Subrahmaṇyaśāstrin follows Jagannātha and criticises Appayyadīkṣita's views in *Kuvalayānanda* and *Citramīmāṁsā*.

Works dealing with *Alaṅkāras* only, which form the majority, are noticed above. There are about 17 works dealing with *Rasa* and allied topics such as *Dhvani, Bhāva, Vṛtti, Guṇa*, etc. These works are generally rich with the vast material drawn

---

1. M.O.L., No. R. 1805; Transcription 7207-8.

from the earlier authorities on *Rasa* such as Bharata, Abhinavagupta, Bhoja, Dhanañjaya, Mammaṭa, Vidyānātha and others. All the questions connected with number and nature of *Rasa* are lucidly presented and discussed. Some of the crucial points are elucidated. A brief account of these works on *Rasa* and allied topics is given here:

51. *Śṛṅgāramañjarī* of Baḍe Akbar
52. *Rasacandrikā* of Madhusūdana Kavīndra
53. *Rasacandrikā* of Viśveśvara Paṇḍita
54. *Rasaratnahāra* of Śivarāma Tripāṭhin
55. *Rasavilāsa* of Bhūdeva Śukla
56. *Rasamahārṇava* of Gokulanātha Maithila
57. *Śṛṅgārāmṛtalaharī* of Samarāja Dīkṣita
58. Rasamīmāṁsā of Gaṅgārāma Jaḍin
59. *Rasakaumudī* } of Ghāsī Rāma Paṇḍita
60. *Rasacandra* } of Ghāsī Rāma Paṇḍita
61. *Rasaprapañca* of Veṅkaṭaśāstrin
62. *Śṛṅgārahāra* of Baladeva
63. *Alaṅkārasāra* of Nṛsiṁhasudhī
64. *Rasaviveka* of unknown authorship
65. *Ramacandrayaśobhūṣaṇa* of Kacchapeśvara Dīkṣita
66. *Rasacandrikā* of Veṅkaṭācārya
67. *Rasamañjarī* of Śrīnivāsārya

51. Śṛṅgāramañjarī[1] of Baḍe Akbar

Śṛṅgāramañjarī deserves our attention as a work written by a muslim writer in Sanskrit. The author Sait Akbar Shah, also called Baḍe Akbar, was the son of Śāharāja, who was the preceptor of King Abdul Hasan (1644-1704 A.D.). The author's patron, Bande Navāz Hazrat, was the saint of Goshu Dara of Gulbarga in Karnataka (formerly in Nizam's dominions). It is said that the author died very young at the age of 36. Hence Dr. Raghavan thinks that he might have complete the work by about 1675 A.D.

The work *Śṛṅgāramañjarī* quotes a number of authorities such as *Daśarūpaka*, *Kāvyaprakāśa*, *Rasamañjarī*, *Śṛṅgāratilaka*, *Pratāparudrīya* and *Sāhityaratnākara*. The author criticises *Rasamañjarī* frequently. The work has been a Sanskrit version of the Telugu original by the author himself.

52. Rasacandrikā[2] of Madhusūdana Kavīndra[3]

Rasacandrikā is a unique work of this period dealing with divine erotics (*Śṛṅgāra*). The author, *Madhusūdanakavīndra*, was at the court of Rāmajīvana (son of Rāghava of Nadi family), who ruled for 51 years and earned special favour in the court of Delhi. The work was composed in *Śaka*

1. Ed. Dr. V. Raghavan, Hyd. Arçhae, Dep., 1951.
2. Ed. Dr. S.N.G. Shastri, Viśvabhāratī, 1969.
3. Editors Introduction, pp. i-ii.

1617 (i.e., 1695 A.D.). It was composed at the request of king *Rāmajīvana*. Dealing with divine erotics, the author presents Lord Kṛṣṇa as the only hero and the heroines as many in number. The work is in 16 *Ālokas* dealing in detail with *Rasas* and allied topics such as *Nāyaka, Nāyikā, Ceṣṭā, Hāva, Bhāva*, etc., and finally with four *Vṛttis* and a topic like *Rasa-arasa*. An *anyokti* work called *Anyāpadeśaśataka*[1] is also credited to Madhusūdana, whose surname is *Dujanti*.

53. Rasacandrikā[2] of Viśveśvara Paṇḍita

This Viśveśvara Paṇḍita is the same as the author of *Alaṅkārakaustubha, Alaṅkāramuktāvalī* and *Alaṅkārapradīpa* (No. S.27, 28 and 29 above). *Rasacandrikā* deals with *Nāyikā, Nāyaka, Rasa, Bhāva, Śabdavyāpāras* and the varieties of *Dhvani*. It summarises the important views on the nature and number of *Rasas* and criticises the views opposed to the tradition of nine *Rasas*. The *Rasa*-theory is succinctly and lucidly stated. Thus it is a very useful manual on the above topics.

54. Rasaratnahāra[3] of Śivarāma Tripāṭhin

Rasaratnahāra is a short work devoted to be treatment of *Rasa*. Śivarāma Tripāṭhin, the author,

---

1. Printed, Bombay.
2. Ed. Chowkhambha, Banares, 1926.
3. *Kāvyamālā*, 6, pp. 118-142.

was the son of Kṛṣṇarāma and grandson of Trilokacandra. He is identical with the commentator of *Vāsavadattā*[1] in which he refers to *Rasaratnahāra*. He also quotes *Paribhāṣenduśekhara*. Thus he must have flourished in the beginning of 18th century A.D. *Rasaratnahāra* consists of 102 stanzas dealing with 9 *Rasas* and connected topics like *Nāyikā*, *Nāyaka* and the accessaries of *Rasa* such as *Vyabhicāribhāvas*, *Sāttvikabhāvas* and *Rītis* appropriate to the respective *Rasas*. The author has provided a commentary of his own called *Lakṣmīvilāsa* in which he quotes profusely from Dhanañjaya and Bhānudatta. Another work of the author called *Alaṅkārasamudgaka* is cited at the end of his *Rāvaṇapuravadha* (among his 34 works).

55. Rasavilāsa[2] of Bhūdeva Śukla

Bhūdeva Śukla, the author of *Rasavilāsa*, was the son of Śukadeva of Jambūsar in Gujarāt. He refers to Jagannātha's definition of *Kāvya*. His date is stated to be from 1660 to 1720 A.D. This work has seven chapters called *Stabakas*. The first two chapters deal with *Rasa*; the third and the fourth treat of *Bhāvas* and *guṇas* respectively; the fifth and the sixth explain *Doṣas*; and the last chapter deals with *Vṛttis* (*Abhidhā*, etc.).

---

1. Fitzedward Hall, *Bibliotheca* India Edition, 1859. *Rasaratnahāra* quoted on pages 4,9,193,206,207.

2. Ed. Premlatha Sarma, Poona, 1952.

work deals with nine *Rasas, Bhāva, Ābhāsa,* etc., (*Rasādi*). The second work is in four chapters dealing with *Nāyakagaṇabheda, Nāyakasaṅgha, Anubhāvādigaṇa* and *Rasadaśaka* respectively.

61. Rasaprapañca[1] of Veṅkaṭaśāstrin

Rasaprapañca deals with *Rasas, Bhāvas,* etc. The author, Āṇivilla Veṅkaṭaśāstrin, is the same as the author of *Apparāyayaśaścandrodaya* and *Alaṅkārasudhāsindhu* noticed above (Nos. 6 and 38 respectively). The details known about the author are given under No. 6.

62. Śṛṅgārahāra[2] of Baladeva

Not much is known about the author except that he was the son of Keśava. The manuscript of this work on *Rasa* is dated *Saṁvat* 1845 (i.e., 1789-90 A.D.).

63. Alaṅkārasāra of Nṛsiṁhasudhī

Alaṅkārasāra is available in a paper manuscript[3] of probably 18th century A.D. It seems to be a chapter of a larger work by Nṛsiṁhasudhī. There is no information about the author. As evident from this work, the author subscribes to the view of Bhoja and Siṅgabhūpāla in holding that *Śṛṅgāra* is alone the *Rasa* and the other *Rasas,*

1. M.K. : H.C.S.L., P. 806.
2. S.K. De : S.P.I., P. 291.
3. M.O.R.I., No. C.704.

Hāsya, etc., are *Bhāvas*. The author quotes profusely from *Śṛṅgāraprakāśa* and *Rasārṇvasudhākara*, besides other authorities on *Rasa*.

64. Rasaviveka[1] of unknown authorship

Nothing is known about the author. The author does not mention his name. He merely refers his *Guru*, Dakṣiṇāmūrti and his brother, Saujanyabhūṣaṇakavi. The work, *Rasaviveka*, is in three chapters dealing with *Rasasvarūpa*, *Rasādhikarṇa* and *Rasabheda*. The scribe of the manuscript is Kṛṣṇa, who gives the date of the manuscript as :

Nale varṣe sahomāse pūrṇimāyāṃ jñavāsare/

Grantho rasavivekākhyaḥ kṛṣṇena likhito'bhavat//

In 19th century A.D., some works on Rasa and allied topics are *Rāmacandrayaśəbhūṣaṇa* of Kacchapeśvaradīkṣita, *Rasacandrikā* of Śrīnivāsārya. A brief account of these works is given below:

65. Rāmacandrayaśobhūṣaṇa[2] of Kacchapeśvaradīkṣita

Kacchapeśvaradīkṣita, the author of this work, was the son of Vāsudeva Yajvan and lived at Brahmadeśa, a village in the North Arcot District. The author's grand-father was Kālahastīśvara

1. Des. Cat., Madras, R.No. 589; the manuscript was purchased from *Sāmbaśivaśāstrin*, Tirunancoil in Tirunevelly District. Tanjore Cat. No. 5288.

2. M.O.L. No. D. 12950; Des. Cat. XXII, 8690.

Yajvan, the author of a commentary on *Bhāgavata*. Nārāyaṇa Yajvan and Kṛṣṇa Yajvan were his paternal uncles.[1] The author eulogises Bommarāja, the Zamindar of Karvetnagar, Madras, who lived in the first quarter of 19th century A.D. *Rāmacandrayaśobhūṣaṇa* deals with *Śṛṅgāra*, other *Rasas* and *Bhāvas* in its three chapters.

66. Rasacandrikā[2] of Veṅkaṭācārya

The author of *Rasacandrikā*, Veṅkaṭācārya, is not the same as Kirīṭi Veṅkaṭācārya, the author of *Alaṅkārakaustubha* noticed above (No.44). However, there is a close correspondence between the two works in regard to the method of treatment and style of writing. He was the son of Sorappārya, while Kirīṭi Veṅkaṭācārya was the son of Aṇṇayārya. Both belong to the Tirumala Bukkappaṭṭanakula of Surpur. The author belongs to the end of 18th century and the beginning of 19th century A.D.

Rasacandrikā is like a running essay on *Rasas* and allied topics, as *Alaṅkārakaustubha* is on *Alaṅkāras*. The illustrations are drawn from various sources. The author introduces some interesting discussions on problems like distinction between *Vipralambha-Śṛṅgāra* and *Karuṇa*, inclusion of *Sāttvikabhāvas* in *Anubhāvas*, etc. The available

1. Contribution of Andhra to Sanskrit Literature; Dr. P. Sriramamurti, P. 126.
2. Madras Adyar L. Ms.

manuscript of the work breaks off at the end of discussion on *Sveda,* the fourth *Sāttvikabhāva.*

67. Rasamañjarī[1] of Śrīnivāsārya

Śrīnivāsārya or Śrīnivāsācārya belongs to the same family as Veṅkaṭācārya's (Nos. 44 & 66), i.e., Śrīśaila family of Surpur. He was the son of Veṅkaṭācārya's brother and the author of another work called *Tattvamārtaṇḍa. Rasamañjarī* deals with *Rasas* and allied topics.

Some works of 18th and 19th centuries deal with other topics like *Śabdavṛttis, Citrakāvya,* enigmatology, *Kāvyalakṣaṇa,* etc. First we give an account of the works dealing with *Śabdavṛttis, Abhidhā, Lakṣaṇā,* etc. Prior to this period we are familiar with the works of Mukulabhaṭṭa and Mammaṭa dealing with this topic.[2] Mukula's *Abhidhāvṛttamātṛkā* deals with *Abhidhā* and *Lakṣaṇā.* Mammaṭa's *Śabdavyāpāravicāra* is an independent work made up of *Kārikās and Vṛtti,* dealing with the nature and varieties of three *Śabdavyāpāras, Abhidhā, Lakṣaṇā* and *Vyañjanā,* in much greater detail than in the second and third *Ullāsas* of *Kāvyaprakāśa.* Inspired by this independent treatment of the topic, some writers of this period have also dealt with *Śabdavyāpāras* in independent works. Such works are : *Śabdabhedanirūpaṇa* of

1. Triannial Cat., Madras, I Report No. 369.
2. Both the works Edited and Published : Ed. M.R. Telang. Also Appayyadīkṣita's *Vṛttivārtika.*

Rāmabhadradīkṣita (Makhin), *Śabdabhedanirūpaṇa* of Veṅkaṭakṛṣṇa, *Śabdabhedanirūpaṇa* of Nārāyaṇa, *Kovidānanda* and *Triveṇikā* of Āśādhara.

Here the first three works of the same name by three different writers, belong to the same time and patronage. Śāhajī, the Maratha King of Tanjore in the first decade of 18th century A.D., who patronised Kāśī Lakṣmaṇakavi (the author of *Śāhabhūpālaṅkāra* - No. 25), entrusted the work of composing three treatises on *Śabdavyāpāra* to the three scholars of his court, Rāmabhadradīkṣita, Veṅkaṭakṛṣṇa and Nārāyaṇa. This was how, the three works of the same name came into being. Although the three works deal with the same topic, the method of treatment, and the material presented differ from each other. A brief account of these works is given here:

68. Śabdabhedanirūpaṇa of[1] Rāmabhadradīkṣita (Makhin)

Śabdabhedanirūpaṇa of Rāmabhadradīkṣita commences with reference to three kinds of *Śabda* in *Kāvya*, as *Śakta*, *Lākṣaṇika* and *Vyañjaka* and proceeds to examine them in detail with suitable illustrations drawn from poetical works. This very manuscript contains the other two works of the same name noticed below :

---

1. Tanjore Cat. No. 5302.

69. Śabdabhedanirūpaṇa[1] of Veṅkaṭakṛṣṇa

Veṅkaṭakṛṣṇa commences his work with a homage to Rāma and informs that he would compose a work on the kinds of words with the kind suggestion of King Śāhajī. He goes to explain *Śabda* in the manner of a *Naiyāyika* and first classifies *Śabda* as *Dhvanirūpa* and *Varṇarūpa*. It is with the latter variety of *Śabda* that the author is concerned. *Varṇarūpaśabda* may be *arthavān* or *anarthaka*. In dealing with *Arthavān- Śabda*, the author comes to explain *Śakti* and *Lakṣaṇā* as accepted by all and *Vyañjanā* as peculiar to the *Ālaṅkārikas*.

70. Śabdabhedanirūpaṇa[2] of Nārāyaṇa

Nārāyaṇa was a disciple of Rāmabhadradīkṣita. Like his teacher, Nārāyaṇa introduces three kinds of words, *Vācaka, Lakṣaka* and *Vyañjaka*. He first classifies *Vācakas* into *Ekārthas* and *Nānārthas* and then gives the classifications of *Vācaka* according to the grammarians. Similarly he explains the varieties of *Lakṣaka* and *Vyañjaka* words. He concludes the work with stanzas in praise of Śāhajī, on whose suggestion he undertook the composition of this work.

---

1. Tanjore Cat. No. 5302.
2. Tanjore Cat. No's. 5302 & 5303.

71. Kovidānanda[1] } **of Aśādhara**
72. Triveṇikā[2]

These two works Āśādhara belong to the middle of 18th century A.D. Āśādhara was the son of Rāmajī and disciple of Dharaṇīdhara. He is known as the author of *Alaṅkāradīpikā*, a commentary on *Kuvalayānanda*. *Kovidānanda* deals with *Śabdavyāpāras*. This is quoted in his other work *Triveṇikā* dealing with *Vṛttis*, *Kaiśikī*, *Ārabhaṭī*, etc.

Three works of this period, namely *Kavīndrakarṇābharaṇa* of Viśveśvarapaṇḍita, *Citracamatkāramañjarī* of Veṅkaṭa and *Veṅkaṭādrīya* of Carla Veṅkaṭa are of particular interest, since they deal exclusively with enigmatology and *Citrakāvya* of various types. Enigmatology has been treated in an earlier work called *Vidagdhamukha-maṇḍana*. *Citrabandha* has been one of the topics dealt with by the *Ālaṅkārikas* in connecting with *Śabdālaṅkāras*. That has been treated in one of the chapters of their works. This kind of composition has been looked upon as *Adhamakāvya*. Yet it is always regarded as a mark of great skill in verification as evident from the fact that *Bhāravi*, *Māgha* and other poets have devoted full cantos in their *Mahākāvyas* to such stanzas. This has inspired some *Ālaṅkārikas* of this period to deal with

---

1. Aufrecht, ii. 25a.
2. Ed. Sarasvati Bhavan Series, Benares, 1925.

Citrakāvya in independent works. A brief account of these works is given here :

73. Kavīndrakarṇābharaṇa[1] of Viśveśvara Paṇḍita

Viśveśvara Paṇḍita of Almoḍa region is already introduced in this section as the author of four works on *Alaṅkāra-śāstra* (vide Nos. 27,28,29 & 53). *Kavīndrakarṇābharaṇa* is a work modelled on *Vidagdhamukhamaṇḍana,* which the author acknowledges. In this work, the author defines various kinds of *Jāti* (Enigma) in *Kārikās* and explains them in the *Vṛtti.* He illustrates these varieties with his own stanzas. Then several kinds of *Citrabandha* are explained and illustrated.

74. Citracamatkāramañjarī[2] of Veṅkaṭa (Āṇivilla)

Veṅkaṭa, the author of *Citracamatkāramañjarī,* was the son of Nārāyaṇa, the author of *Sāhityakalpadruma* (No.7) and grandson of Veṅkaṭaśāstrin, the author of *Apparāyayaśa-ścandrodaya* and *Alaṅkārasudhāsindhu* (Nos. 6 & 38). He was a scion of Āṇivilla family and was known as *Bālakālidāsa.*

Citracamatkāramañjarī deals exclusively with configurative stanzas (*citrabhandhas*) of various kinds. The stanzas here are dedicated to Śrī Vatsaśāyī Timma Jagapati Mahārāja of Peddāpur, East Godāvarī District, who lived about 1745 A.D.

1. Kāvyamālā, Part VIII, 1891.
2. M.K. : H.C.S.L., P. 806.

The author's efficiency in composing *citrabandhas* is evident from his another work called *Sūryaśataka*.

75. Veṅkaṭādrīyam[1] of Carla Veṅkaṭa

Carla Veṅkaṭaśāstrin, son of Lakṣmaṇa was a pupil of Āṇivilla Veṅkaṭaśāstrin, the grandfather of Āṇivilla Veṅkaṭa noticed above. His work, *Veṅkaṭādrīyam*, is also a work on *Citrakāvya* like Veṅkaṭa's *Citracamatkāramañjarī*. This author has also composed a commentary called *Nauka* on *Sāhityaratnākara* of Dharmasudhī.

Poetic convention (*Kavisamaya*) has been another fascinating topic engaging the mind of Sanskrit Rhetoricians. This topic finds a place in the *Alaṅkāra* works like *Kāvyamīmāṁsā* of Rājaśekhara. Some of the major works of this period also, such as *Nañjarājayaśobhūṣaṇa* of Nṛsiṁha (No. 1) *Alaṅkāramaṇidarpaṇa* of Veṅkāmātya (No. 11) *Sāhityasāra of Acyutarāya* (No. 18), *Alaṅkārasūtra of Kṛṣṇāvadhūtapaṇḍita* (No. 21), etc., incidentally deal with *Kavisamaya*. An independent work on *Kavisamaya*, belonging to 19th century A.D., has been available. That is the work of Anantārya called *Kavisamayakallola*.

76. Kavisamayakallola[2] of Anantārya

Anantārya, also called Anantāḷvan, was the son of Siṅgarācārya of Śeṣācārya family at

1. M.K. : H.C.S.L., P. 806.

2. Mad. Cat. 8613, No. 12808 & Melkote Cat.

Yādavagiri (Melkote) in Karnataka. He is the author of *Kṛṣṇarājayaśoḍiṇḍima*, which illustrates the greatness of Mummaḍi Kṛṣṇarāja Odeyar of Mysore (1714-1731 A.D.). Thus the author belongs to the first half of 18th century A.D. Another work named *Kṛṣṇarājakalodaya*[1] also seems to be his. *Kavisamayakallola* is an idependent work on poetic conventions. This work quotes *Kṛṣṇarājayaśoḍiṇḍima*. There are also some practical guidelines for the beginners to compose poetry.

Now among the other works of this period, a brief account of *Daśarūpakapaddhati* of Kuravi Rāma, *Rasikarasāyanam* of unknown authorship and *Kāvyacandrikā* of Nyāyavāgīśaśarman, is given. This will be followed by an account of some works dealing separately with such topics and *Kāvyalakṣaṇa*, *Kāvyātmā*, etc.

77. Daśarūpakapaddhati[2] of Kuravi Rāma

Kuravi Rāma, the author of *Daśarūpakapaddhati*, was in the court of the *Zamindar* of Karvetnagar in the 19th century A.D. He is also the author of commentaries on *Bhāratacampū*, *Kuvalayānanda* and *Viśvaguṇādarśacampū*. *Daśarūpakapaddhati* is a brief treatise on dramaturgy in 110 stanzas.

---

1. O.R.I., Mysore Nos. 869 & 299.
2. Contribution of Andhra to Sanskrit Literature Dr. P. Sriramamurti; S.K. De : S.P. I, P. 127.

78. Rasikarasāyanam[1] of unknown authorship

Rasikarasāyanam is said to be a late and anonymous work. The author of this work is not known. The available manuscript of this work is incomplete. The first two chapters dealing with ten *Rūpakas* and *Kāvya* respectively, are available in full. The manuscript breaks off after *Āvega* in the third chapter called *Nāyikādiprakaraṇa*. It is clear from the available portion that this work draws heavily on *Daśarūpaka* and *Pratāparudrīya*.

79. Kāvyacandrikā[2] of Nyāyāvagīśa

Not much is known about the author of *Kāvyacandrikā*. It is not clear whether he is identical with Nyāyavāgīśa Bhaṭṭacārya, the author of *Kāvyamañjarī* on *Kuvalayānanda*.[3] This work is published with a commentary called *Alaṅkāramañjūṣā* by Rāmacandra Śarman, who lived under the patronage of Jīvanasiṁhavarman, the king of Sūryagaḍha in Jayapur Kingdom. This work deals with *Kāvyalakṣaṇa*, *Kāvyadoṣa*, important *Alaṅkāras* and *Samasyāpūrti*.

80. Kāvyalakṣaṇavicāraḥ[4] of unknown authorship

Kāvyalakṣaṇavicāraḥ of unknown authorship is a treatise on the general definition of *Kāvya*. It

---

1. Adyar Library, No. TR.397
2. Printed, Venkateshwara Press, Bombay, 1912.
3. S.K. De, Sanskrit Poetics, I.P. 229.
4. Mad. Cat. P. 8716, 1717, No. 12979 (5B-1-5).

quotes from various works such as *Kāvyaprakāśa*, *Citramīmāṁsā* and *Rasagaṅgādhara* and discusses the same.

81. Lakṣaṇamālikā[1] (Lakṣyalakṣaṇamālikā) of unknown authorship

Lakśaṇamālikā or *Lakṣyalakṣaṇamālikā* is intended for the use of the beginners in the *Śāstra*. It deals with the hero, *Kāvya*, *Rasa*, *Alaṅkāra* and *Nāṭakapaddhati*. The author of this work is unknown. The available manuscript breaks off in the section of *Utprekṣā*. The manuscript also contains a commentary called *Alaṅkārenduśekhara* by Nṛsiṁhakavi of Surpur, son of Dāsamācārya of Śriśaila family. Extracts from this commentary are given in Śrī. M. Śeṣagiri Śāstri's Report No. 1.[2]

82. Kāvyātmasaṁśodhana[3] of Mānavallī Gaṅgādhara Śāstrin

Mānavallī Gaṅgādharaśāstrin was the son of Nṛsiṁha, an Āndhra Brahmin of Hesaragaṭṭa (near Bangalore). He was professor at Benares about 1879 A.D. His date is 1854-1914 A.D. He was given the title of Mahāmahopādhyāya. He has also written a gloss on *Rasagaṅgādhara*.

---

1. Mad. Cat. P. 8715, No. 12953 & 12978.
2. No. 22, Pages 11 and 98; Contribution of Andhra to Sanskrit Literautre : Dr. P. Sriramamurti, pp. 144-145.
3. Contribution of Andhra to Skt. Lit. P. 167, M. Krishnamachariar : History of Classical Sanskrit Literature, P.486.

83. Sāhityakalpalatikā[1] of Kṛṣṇasūri

Kṛṣṇasūri (Śāntalūri) is the same as the author of *Alaṅkāramīmāṁsā,* a brief account of which is given above (No. 37). *Sāhityakalpalatikā* is not a work on any topic of *Alaṅkāraśāstra* in literary compositions. The fifth *stabaka* is particularly a defence of *Amarakośa* against the criticism levelled by Śrī Harṣa in his *Amarakhaṇḍana.*

The above brief account of the *Alaṅkāra* works of 18th and 19th centuries, shows the extent and nature of the *Alaṅkāra* literature during this period. A study of these work reveals the following points:

1. These works present a consolidated account of the developments in the different aspects of *Alaṅkāraśāstra* after Mammaṭa, engrafting the points made by the commentators such as Govinda Ṭhakkura and Nāgojī Bhaṭṭa on *Kāvyaprakāśa* and *Kumārasvāmin* on *Pratāparudrīya.*

2. They continue the new spirit of enquiry initiated by the eminent writers of the preceding century, Appayyadīkṣita and Jagannātha and enrich it further under the impact of the scholastic developments in the field of *Śāstras* like *Navyanyāya, Vyākaraṇa* and *Mīmāṁsā.*

---

1. M.K. : H.S.C.L., P. 783.

3. These works critically review the points of academic controversy between Appayyadīkṣita and Jagannātha regarding the various problems of poetics and elucidate them in their exposition. Thus they provide a perspective to understand the problems raised by Appayyadīkṣita and Jagannātha which have a historical background.

4. The contribution of the writers of this period lies in the exposition of the various concepts of *Alaṅkāraśāstra,* but not in promulgating new theories of poetry.

• • •

Part-II

The Contribution of Post-Jagannātha Works on *Alaṅkāraśāstra*

A critical study of the 18th and 19th century works on *Alaṅkāraśāstra* is apt to reveal the range and richness of the contribution of the writers of this period to *Alaṅkāraśāstra*. What is striking at the outset is the *number of works* produced during this period. Reaching the phase of *Alaṅkāraśāstra* represented by Appayyadīkṣita and Jagannātha, we felt that we had come almost to the end of the history of *Alaṅkāraśāstra*. This feeling arose because we did not have the full gauge of the number and range of *Alaṅkāra* works of 18th and 19th centuries. As the present investigation has revealed, the number of works on *Alaṅkāra-śāstra* produced during this period is as large as 83. This estimate is based on the actual scrutiny of the manuscripts after a preliminary list prepared on the basis of the catalogues, reports and brief survey of these in the histories of *Alaṅkāraśāstra* such as those of Dr. P.V. Kaṇe and Dr. S.K. De.

Among these 83 works, 26 works give comprehensive account of all the topics of

Alaṅkāraśāstra. Among these Narasiṁha's *Nañjarājayaśobhūṣaṇa,* Veṅkāmātya's *Alaṅkāramaṇidarpaṇa* are important from the point of view of both the thoroughness with which the material is presented and the critical perspective with which their views are expressed. The rest of the works deal with one or two topics of *Alaṅkāraśāstra* such as *Alaṅkāra, Rasa, Śabdavṛttis,* Enigmatology, *Citrakāvya, Kavisamaya, Kāvyalakṣaṇa,* etc. The majority of these works, i.e., 24, deal with *Alaṅkāras* and 16 works are exclusively devoted to *Rasa.* Viśveśvara Paṇḍita's *Alaṅkārakaustubha,* Lakṣmaṇasūri's *Śrīśāhabhūpālaṅkāra,* Devaśaṅkara Purohita's *Alaṅkāramañjūṣā,* Ciranjīva Bhaṭṭācārya's *Kāvyavilāsa,* Kirīṭi Veṅkaṭācārya's *Alaṅkārakaustubha* and Śrīkṛṣṇa Brahmatantra Parakālayati's *Alaṅkāramaṇihāra,* are important since they make a thorough study of the concepts of all *Alaṅkāras* and discuss the salient problems connected with the conception and mutual distinction of the *Alaṇkāras,* giving striking illustrations of their own. *Utprekṣāmañjarī* of Varadācārya is unique among *Alaṅkāra* treatises for its treatment of *Utprekṣā* alone in all its verieties. The important works on *Rasa* are *Rasacandrikā* of Madhusūdana, *Rasaratnahāra* of Śivarāma Tripāṭhin, *Rasacandrikā* of Śrīśaila Veṅkaṭācārya and *Alaṅkārasāra* of Nṛsiṁhsūdhī. Among these the last work is a unique representative of the *Śṛṅgāraikarasavāda* during the period. Other works on *Rasa* deserve special

mention for their authoritative account of *Rasa* and allied topics and for the discussions on the various problems on *Rasa,* especially pertaining to the number of *Rasas* and the *āśraya* and nature of *Rasa*-experience.

Five independent works on *Śabdavṛttis* during 18th and 19th centuries deserve special mention in view of the fact that in the earlier several centuries only 3 independent works on this topic, viz., *Abhidhāvṛttamātṛkā* of Mukula, *Śabdavyāpāravicāra* of Mammaṭa and Appayyadīkṣita's *Vṛttivārtika* are known. The works on *Śabdavṛttis* are : The three *Śabdabhedanirūpaṇa-s* of Ramabhadra Dīkṣita, Veṅkaṭakṛṣṇa and Nārāyaṇa and two works of Āśādhara viz., *Kovidānanda* and *Triveṇikā*. Eight other works of the period deal with Enigmatology, *Citrabandha, Kavisamaya, Kāvyalakṣaṇa* and *Kāvyātman*. *Kavīndrakarṇābharaṇa* of Viśveśvara is a very interesting work in enigmatology. *Kavisamaya-kallola* of Anatārya is an independent work on *Kaviśikṣā* and *Kavisamaya*. Kṛṣṇāvadhūtapaṇḍita's *Kāvyalakṣaṇasaṅgraha* and Gaṅgādharaśāstrin's *Kāvyātmasaṁśodhana*[1] deal with the definition of *Kāvya* and *Kāvyātman* respectively.

Thus the writers of this period have contributed to all the topics of *Alaṅkāraśāstra*. Since they belong to a period as late as 18th and 19th centuries, before which all the major theories of

1. Contribution of Andhra to Skt. Lit. P. 167.

poetics were formulated and established in their proper perspective by the writers from Bharata to Jagannātha, they have not much to add so far as the fundamentals are concerned. But their contribution to the various topics of *Alaṅkāraśāstra* lies in elaboration, clarification, additional points, re-interpretation and deviation from their predecessores regarding the individual concepts coming under the topics such as *Kāvyalakṣaṇa*, *Kāvyaprayojana*, *Śabdavyāpāra*, *Dhvani*, *Rasa*, *Guṇa*, *Alaṅkāra*, *Vṛtti*, *Rīti*, *Śayyā*, *Pāka*, etc. The major points of their account of these topics are given below with a view to highlighting their contribution to *Alaṅkāraśāstra*.

Kāvyalakṣaṇa

The fundamental conception of *Kāvya* is that it is the harmoneous blending of expression (*śabda*) and thought (*artha*). This conception of poetry has come down from Bhāmaha, Mammaṭa and Vidyānātha. Writers of this period such as Narasiṁha, Veṅkāmātya, and Acyutarāya take this as the basis of their thinking and make some special points of their own. Narasiṁha in his *Nañjarājayaśobhūṣaṇa*, emphasises the necessity of expression and thought being in conformity with extra-ordinary poetic convention (*Kavisamaya*).[1] Here the concept of *Kavisamaya* is given a wider

1. Kavisamayānurodhena nibaddhau sabdārthau kāvyam (Nañjarājayaśobhūṣaṇa, p.14)

significance by Narasiṁha. It includes the poetic conventions already established in the usage of poets as well as the aspects of poetic creation of the individual poets through *Vyañjanāvyāpāra* utilising the poetic devices such as *Guṇa, Alaṅkāra,* etc., leading to the delineation of *Rasa* and other forms of Suggestion.[1] Cāvalī Rāmasudhī in his *Sāhityacintāmaṇi* accepts the same conception of *Kavisamaya* and fully agrees with Narasiṁha's view on the special requirements of expression and thought constituting poetry.[2] Kṛṣṇāvadhūtapaṇḍita also adopts this definition in his *Sārasvatālaṅkārasūtra.*[3]

Veṅkāmātya in his *Alaṅkāramaṇidarpaṇa,* bestows his thought on the special point made by Narasiṁha regarding *Kavisamaya* and makes some critical observations on Narasiṁha's definition of poetry as a prelude to his definition of poetry. He feels that *Kavisamaya* even in its wider sense, cannot be an exclusive characteristic of poetry, because *Kavisamayas* are found in the *Mahābhārata.*[4] However, as his illustrations show, there are close affinities between some portions of the *Mahābhārata,* such as *Nalopākhyāna, Śākuntalopākhyāna,* etc., and

---

1. Nadīṣu padmotpalāni saromātre haṁsāḥ...... ...vyañjanārūpaśabdavyāpārakalpanaṁ ceti Kavisamayaḥ (*N.Y.*, p. 14)
2. *Sāhityacintāmaṇi*, P.38
3. *Sārasvatālaṅkārasūtra*, I. iv.1.
4. *Alaṅāramaṇidarpaṇa*, f. 3b-4b.

the *Mahākāvya* of later times. Hence to question the definition of poetry given by Narasiṁha on this ground is not convincing. Yet his view is that the definition of poetry should bring out its exclusive characteristic in keeping with its purpose of *Kāntāsaṁmitopadeśa* as distingushed from *Suhṛtsaṁmitopadeśa*, the special feature of *Itihāsa* like the *Mahābhārata*. *Sarasatva* is the distinct feature of poetry. Hence, Veṇkāmātya takes special care to bring out this speical point in his definition of poetry, viz., the blending of expression and thought that are charged with emotion.[1] He emphasises that expression and thought should be characterised by a charming sequence evolved by the poet so as to serve the purpose of suggesting *Rasa*. Turning to the technical side of the *definition* of poerty, Veṅkāmātya thinks that the term *sarasa* is more essential than the terms *adoṣa, saguṇa* or *sālaṅkāra*. Thus he is indirectly finding fault with the difinitions of Mammaṭa and Vidyānātha who do not use the term *sarasa,* while they use the other adjectives in their definitions of poetry. In effect, Veṅkāmātya, like Viśvanātha, gives the definition of an ideal *Kāyva*, i.e., *Rasādidhvanikāvya* and applies it secondarily to other kinds of *Kāvya*.

Acyutarāya, in his *Sāhityasāra*, contributes a novel interpretation of the term *Guṇa* while

1. Kavikalpitānupūrvīviśiṣṭasarasaśabdārthobhayatvaṁ kāvyatvam. (*A.m.d.*, f. 4b)

accepting the definition of *Kāvya* according to Mammaṭa and Jayadeva. The absence of *Doṣa* and the evolution of *Guṇa* are the two characteristics of *Kāvya* according to Acyutarāya. Thus in its terminology his definition of *Kāvya* does not differ from that of Mammaṭa. Jayadeva uses other adjectives such as *Vṛtti, Rīti,* etc., also in his definition of *Kāvya*. Having been guided by the idea of avoiding the prolixity witnessed in the older definitions of *Kāvya,* he widens the scope of the term *Guṇa* to include the ideas of all the salient sources of poetic charm such as *Mādhuryādiguṇas, Rasa, Lakṣaṇa, Rīti, Alaṅkāra* and *Vṛtti. Guṇa,* according to him, is the principle of poetic delight itself (*rasikāhlādakatva*).[1] This conception of Guṇa enables him to shape his definition of *Kāvya* with only two adjectives, i.e., *adoṣatva* and *saguṇatva.* Whether we accept this conception of *Guṇa* or not, this is a matter of opinion. However, as already indicated in the relevant section, Acyutarāya has a precedent in the older conception of *Alaṅkāra* as understood by Daṇḍin, Vāmana and others. *Alaṅkāra* is the element of beauty itself, yet it is used in the narrower sense of figures of speech also. *Guṇa* is, likewise, the principle of delight itself, yet used to denote *Rasādidharmas* like

1. Dharmā rasā lakṣaṇāni rītyalaṅkṛtivṛttayaḥ/
Rasikāhlādakā hyete kāvye santi ca ṣaḍguṇāḥ//
(*Sāhityasāra,* I.20)

Mādhurya. Thus what was then *Alaṅkāra* to Daṇḍin and Vāmaṇa is now *Guṇa* to Acyutarāya.

These definitions of *Kāvya*, which differ in detail but show cognate ways of thinking, contribute to one of the traditions initiated by Bhāmaha laying emphasis on both *expression* and *thought* on the ground that poetic charm resides in both. The other tradition was initiated by Daṇḍin and later revived by Jagannātha in a new perspective. According to this traditon, poetry is the expression itself conveying a charming sense. Some writers of this period contribute to this tradition emphasising expression as the *svarūpa* of *Kāvya*. For instance, *Kṛṣṇasudhī*, the author of *Kāvyakalānidhi*, quotes the definition of *Kāvya* given by Jagannātha. But keeping this definition side by side with the definitions of *Kāvya* by Mammaṭa and Vidyānātha, he seems to imply that the conception of Poetry from whatever angle is the same, provided the technical differences are surmounted. Lakṣmaṇakavi adopts Jagannātha's definition of *Kāvya* in totto.[1]

These different special points contributed by the writers of this period to the topic of *Kāvyalakṣaṇa* open up new avenues of thinking for the scholars to pursue. All these different ways of looking at

1. Kāvyalakṣaṇaṁ tu vilakṣaṇacamatkārāvacchinna-camatkārajanakatāvacchedakatāśālidhīviṣayārthabodhaka-śabdatvam. (*Śrīśāhabhūpālaṅkāra*, f.lb)

kāvya only convince us further that the full significance of *Kāvya* is too elusive to catch in the hooks of a definition.

Kāvyaprayojana

Kāvyaprayojana or *purposes of poetry* is one of the conventional topics discussed by the writers on *Alaṅkāraśāstra* right from the time of Bharata. The consensus that has evolved is that *Kāvya* is neither exclusively for entertainment nor exclusively for edification, but for both. *Kāvya* is for delight; *Kāvya* is for extending advice in the manner of a beloved wife-these are the accepted purposes of *Kāvya*. Most of the writers of the period under enquiry take these thoughts on *Kāvyaprayojana* for granted either making passing reference to them through quoting Mammaṭa's famous *Kārikā* or without mentioning them at all. Only two writers, viz., Lakṣmaṇasūri and Acyutarāya have something more to say about *Kāvyaprayojana*. They too base their thoughts on the statements of Vāmana and Mammaṭa and contribute some points by way of reading some of their ideas into the terms used by Vāmana and Mammaṭa. Lakṣmaṇasūri, in his *Śrīśāhabhūpālaṅkāra*, quotes Vāmana's *sūtra* on *Kāvyaprayojana*. Besides explaining the terms *sat* and *prīti* in the way in which Vāmana has done, Lakṣmaṇasūri understands the former in the sense of *that which pertains to a noble hero* and the latter

in the sense of *the delight of the hero.*[1] It is well known that Vāmana refers to the charm of poetry by the term *sat (cāru)* and to the delight obtained from poetry by the term *prīti.* The purpose of poetry that deals with the life of a noble hero is to create delight in the heart of the hero. This is according to the interpretation of the words *sat* and *prīti* of Vāmana's *Prayojanasūtra* by Lakṣmaṇasūri. Similarly, he quotes Mammaṭa's *Kārikā* on *Kāvyaprayojana* and speaks of the different purposes accruing either to the poet alone or to the *sahṛdaya* alone or for both. The acquisition of wealth pleases the poet only; practical wisdom is beneficial to both, the poet and the *sahṛdaya;* instantaneous joy is for the poet, the patron and the *sahṛdaya.* Further to accomodate, the ideas contained in Mammaṭa's *Kārikā* and in Vāmana's *sūtras,* Lakṣmaṇasūri includes the idea of *yaśase* into Vāmana's *Kīrti* and the ideas of the rest of the purposes mentioned by Mammaṭa into *prīti* of Vāmana.[2] Thus the author restricts the meaning of the term *prīti* to *Nāyakaprīti,* on the one hand, and expands its meaning, on the otherhand, to include all the purposes of *Kāvya* except *Yaśas* mentioned by Mammaṭa.

---

1. Sat uttamanāyakaviṣayakam. Prītirnāyakaharṣaḥ. (ibid.,)
2. Atratyadhanādiphalapañcakamapi sūtre prītiśabdena sūcitamiti vibudhā vidāṁkurvantu. (Ibid., f. Ib)

Similarly Acyutarāya reads some of his ideas into the statements of Mammaṭa regarding the purposes of *Kāvya*. For instance, he reads his idea of *dharmajñāna* into Mammaṭa's *vyavahāravide* and that of *muktiprāpti* into Mammaṭa's *śivetarakṣataye* and *sadyaḥ paranirvṛtaye*. Whatever might be the justification of these questions, it is clear that Acyutarāya speaks of acquisition of wealth, fulfilling of desire, attainment of *mokṣa* and advice in the manner of a wife as the purposes of *Kāvya*, the first four for the poet and the last one for the *sahṛdaya*. The first four are called *svārthaphala* and the last *parārthaphala*. This is Acyutarāya's attempt at the grouping of the purposes of *Kāvya* as an alternative to the grouping of the same as *dṛṣṭārtha* and *adṛṣṭārtha* by Vāmana.[1]

Thus the special points of these writers on *Kāvyaproyojana* are by way of reading some of their ideas into the terms used by Vāmana in his *Sūtra* and by Mammaṭa in his *Kārikā*.

Śabdavyāpāra

The study of *Śabdavyāpāra* with special reference to *Kāvya* has been a part of poetics from the time of Mammaṭa, who gives a concise account of *Abhidhā*, *Lakṣaṇā* and *Vyañjanā* taking the key-points from the *Dhvanyāloka* and *Locana* on the one hand and the *Śāstra's* such as *Nyāya*, *Mīmāṁsā*, *Vyākaraṇa*

---

1. Sāhityasāra, p.7.

and *Mukula's Abhidhāvṛttamātṛkā* on the other hand. The writers of 18th and 19th centuries deal with *Śabdavyāpāras* on the same lines. They have also before them the systematic treatment of the topic by Vidyānātha, Vidyādhara, Viśvānātha, Jayadeva, Appayyadīkṣita and Jagannātha. The basic material on *Śabdavyāpāras* is derived from all these works. The authors of this period give as much detail of this topic as they feel adequate for their purpose. In working out the details, they contribute some of their special points in the light of their advance knowledge of the *Śāstras*. The main points of their contribution are by way of i) discussing some problems on the nature and classification of *Abhidhā* and *Lakṣaṇā*, ii) working out the *Lakṣaṇā* basis of certain *Alaṅkāras*, iii) considering the claims of *Tātparyavṛtti in poetry*, and iv) adducing additional arguments in defence of *Vyāñjanā*.

(i) *Abhidhā*

Under *Abhidhā*, Acyutarāya points out a contrast between the views of *Naiyāyikas* and *Mīmāṁsakas* with regard to the basis of *Śakti*, i.e., the expressive power, of words. *Saṅketa* in the form of God's will is the basis of *Śakti* of the *Naiyāyikas*. *Mīmāṁsakas* on the other hand, think that the power of expressing a meaning innate in a word and *Saṅketa* in the form of God's will is not at all necessary. Acyutarāya accepts the *Mīmāṁsakaś* view on *Śakti* and rejects the *Naiyāyika* view on it. He

contributes a sound argument to this view-point. If the *Naiyāyika*-view were to be accepted, then the *Lakṣya*-sense would be as much *Saṅketita* as the *Vācya*-sense would be because nothing could be outside the purview of God's all pervasive will.[1] Thus in accepting the *Svataḥ- sāmarthya* of words with his *Vedānta-bias*, Acyutarāya deviates from the tradition of the *Ālaṅkārikas* which accepts the *Naiyāyika* view-point in this respect. Narsiṁha, Veṅkāmātya and Kṛṣṇāvadhūta Paṇḍita, on the other hand, closely follow the tradition of the *Ālaṅkārikas* on this point.

Under the same topic, Veṅkāmātya discusses a problem pertaining to the classification of *Vācaka* word into *Yaugika, Rūḍha* and *Yogarūḍha*. The problem is with regard to the words like *annadānī, lakṣmīpati* and *sarvajña*. It is objected that they connot be brought under any one of the above groups. Veṅkāmātya comes to the conclusion that these are either *Yaugika* or *Rūḍha* depending on the persons they refer to. When they refer to a donor, a rich man and a wise man, they are *Yaugika*. When, on the other hand, they are used with reference to miser, a poorman and a dunce, they are *Rūḍha*.[2] Veṅkāmātya's contribution in this

1. Ibid., II.5.
2. *Śabdānāṁ yaugikatvaṁ na tāvatsvarūpeṇa kintvartha-bodhanadvārā. Tathā ca sāvayavārthabodhakatve yaugikatvaṁ niravayavārthabodhe rūḍhatvamiti vivekasambhavena, kṛpaṇā-diṣu prayuktānām annadanyādiśabdānāṁ kevalarūḍhatvam,*

regard lies in giving a proper perspective to solve this problem.

(ii) *Lakṣaṇā*

Under the topic of *Lakṣaṇā* also Acyutarāya follows a method of classification different from the one followed by Narasiṁha and Veṅkāmātya, who take it up from Mammaṭa with some minor changes. Following a new method, Acyutarāya analyses thirteen varieties of *Lakṣaṇā*. What is striking is his acceptance of *Jahadajahallakṣaṇā* or *Bhāgatyāgalakṣaṇā* in the field of poetry as in *Vedānta* (*Advaita*) and other *Śāstras*. Rāmasudhī also, in his *Sāhityacintāmaṇi*, accepts this variety of *Lakṣaṇā*.[1] The special contribution of Rāmasudhī in this regard lies in his showing the difference between the *Brahmavādins* and the *Ālaṅkārikas* in the conception of *Jahadajahallakṣaṇā*. Taking the well-known illustration, viz., *Soyaṁ devadattaḥ*, he explains that the *Advaitins* give up the contradictory aspects of *tat* and *idam* and retain the factor of identical nature (*citsvarūpa*), while the *Ālaṅkārikas* give up *tattāṁśa* as a whole as it is incompatible in the present instance and retain *idantāṁśa* as it is compatible at

---

sāvayavārtheṣu dātṛdhanikādiṣu prayuktānāṁ teṣāṁ yaugikatvamiti vivekasambhavāt.

(*Alaṅkāramaṇidarpaṇa*, f. 15b-16b).

1. *Etarhi 'so' yaṁ devadatta nāityatra... svārthasyaivāṁśabhedena hānāhānābhyām ubhaya-vilakṣaṇeyaṁ jahadajahallakṣaṇā.* (*Sāhityacintāmaṇi*, p.5)

present[1]. Thus Rāmasudhī points out the distinct feature of *Jahadajahallakṣaṇā* with special reference to poetry. This reveals not only the *Advaita* bias of Acyutarāya and Rāmasudhī but also their awareness of the special requirment of poetry. Further Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa and Kṛṣṇāvadhūta-paṇḍita accept it in their *Alaṇkāra* works.[2]

Gauṇī Sādhyavasānā Lakṣaṇā explained by the major writers of this period represents another point of divergence from the writers like Mammaṭa and Vidyānātha. In the context of showing the differences among the *Alaṅkāras* based on this variety of *Lakṣaṇā*, Veṅkāmātya implies that *adhyavasāya* is not only the concealment of the *Viṣaya* by the *Viṣayin*, but also the concealment of the *Viṣayin* by the *Viṣaya*.[3] However, this wider

---

1. *Iyāṁstu viśeṣaḥ - brahmavādino..... tattedaṁsa-yoranyonyaviruddhayorapi tyāgena aviruddha-svarūpamātrāparityāgena ca dvayopalakṣitaṁ svarūpamātraṁ lakṣyata iti jahadajahalla-kṣaṇaṁ vyutpādya tattvamasītyādimahāvākye api tattvaṁpadārthagata-viruddhāṁśatyāgena aviruddha- cinmātropādānena cobhayopalakṣitam akhaṇḍaṁ vastu bhāgatyāgalakṣaṇayā pratipāda-yanti. Ālaṅkārikāstu tattāṁśasyedānīm asambha-vāt tadaṁśasyaiva hānam, idantāṁśasyedānīṁ sambhavād ahānamiti jahadajahallakṣaṇamācakṣata ityubhayamate'pīyaṁ lakṣaṇā siddhyatyeva.*
   (Ibid., pp. 57- 58)
2. *Sāhityakaumudī (Kāvyamālā, 63, 1897), pp. 11-12; Sārasvatālaṅkārasūtrāṇi, II. i.20.*
3. *Rūpakātiśayoktau viṣayivācakapadena viṣayasya nigara-ṇaṁ, sambandhātiśayoktau tu viṣayavācakapadena*

conception of *Sādhyavasānā Lakṣaṇā* is not covered by Veṅkāmātya in his definition of the same in the *Lakṣaṇā* section. Kṛṣṇāvadhūtapaṇḍita, on the other hand, makes the wider sense of *Sādhyavasānā* explicit in his definition of this variety of *Lakṣaṇā*. He explains that the *Sādhyavasānā* occurs when either the *Viṣayin* or the *Viṣaya* is alone expressed.[1] Thus Veṇkāmātya and Kṛṣāvadhūta Paṇḍita take *Gauṇī Sādhyavasānā* in a wider sense. This has a purpose to serve in showing the difference between *Rūpakātiśayokti* and *sambandhātiśayokti*.

The most significant contribution of the writers of this period to the topic of *Lakṣaṇā is in* the direction of highlighting the *Lakṣaṇā*-basis of certain *Alaṅkaras*. The major points of this discussion are presented here : (1) *Rūpaka, Pariṇāma, Ullekha, Sandeha* and *Apahnava* are based on *Gauṇī Sāropā*. Inspite of this common basis, they differ from one another by virtue of certain special points of their own, such as the superimposition of the *Viṣayin* upon the *Viṣaya* (*Rūpaka*), the superimposition of the *Viṣaya* upon the *Viṣayin* (*Pariṇāma*), the superimposition of many *Viṣayins* by turns on the same *Viṣaya* (*Ullekha*), the doubt regarding the identity of the Viṣayins in turns with the same *Viṣaya* (*Sandeha*), and the poetic denial of its own

---

viṣayiṇo nigaraṇam. (*Alaṅkāramaṇidarpaṇa*, f.19a)

1. *Viṣayiviṣayānyataropādāne sādhyavasānā gauṇyeva* (*Sārasvatālaṅkārasūtrāṇi, II.i.22*)

attribute in the *Viṣayin* consequent on its superimposition on the *Viṣaya* (*Apahnava*); (2) *Rūpakātiśayokti* and *Anuktaviṣayotprekṣā* are based on *Gauṇī Sādhyavasānā*. In *Rūpakātiśayokti*, the *adhyavasāya* arises out of a similarity that is already accomplished (*siddha-sādṛśya*), while in *Anuktaviṣayotprekṣā* it evolves out of a similarity that is in the process of being accomplished (*sādhya-sādṛśya*). Further the concealment of the *Viṣaya* by the *Viṣayin*, while the same in *Sambandhātiśayokti* is by virtue of the concealment of the *Viṣayin* by the *Viṣaya*.

Acyutarāya brings two more *Alaṅkāras*, viz., *Vyājastuti* and *Kāvyaliṅga*, into the group of *Lakṣaṇā*-based *Alaṅkāras*. *Prayojanavatī Viruddhā-laksaṇā*, which he recognises, is the basis of *Vyājastuti*, while *Prayojanavatī Lakṣitalakṣaṇā* is the basis of *Kāvyaliṅga*. The justification of these points is given by Acyutarāya.[1] As illustrated by him, *Viruddhā Lakṣaṇā* might be the basis of *Vyājastuti*. But the justification of *Lakṣitalakṣaṇā* as the basis of *Kāvyaliṅga* is rather ingenious.

---

1. *Atha prayojanavatī viruddhā, dhanya eve saḥ*
Kiṁ vaktavyamihetyādāvadhanyo lakṣyate'nayā
Vyājastutyalaṅkāraḥ siddyatyasyāḥ prasādataḥ
Prayojanavatī tadvadeṣā lakṣitalakṣaṇā
Vaidehīmavalokyaiva stabdho raghukulodbhavaḥ
Vaidehīti pade lakṣyo videhastatpitā tataḥ
Videhakaivalyamando lakṣyaḥ stabdhatvakārakaḥ
Kāraṇaṁ kāvyaliṅgasyālaṅkṛteriyamīkṣyate
(*Sāhityasāra*, II. 90-93).

(iii) *Tātparyavṛtti*

The rejection of *Tātparyavṛtti* by Narasiṁha and Veṅkāmātya is another noteworthy point in the section on *Śabdavyāpāra*. The fate of *Tātparyavṛtti* is hanging in the balance in the field of *Alaṅkāraśāstra*. The explicit rejection of the *vṛtti* by by Vidyānātha seems to have an implicit sanction from the remarks made by Ānandavardhana in defferent contexts. Narasiṁha and Veṅkāmātya accept this tradition[1] and deviate from the stand of Abhinavagupta and probably Mammaṭa. Veṅkāmātya contributes a special point here by way of clarification. According to Vidyānātha, *Vyañjanā* governs the import which is the suggested sense itself. This holds good in the instances of *Dhvani*. What is the import in *Citrakāvya* where there is no distinct suggested sense? Here Veṅkāmātya clarifies the point by saying that the import in *Citrakāvya* is the expressed *Alaṅkāra* itself.[2] Even here there is no necessity of

---

1. *Kavitātparyasya camatkṛtārthaviṣayatayā kāvyavākyānāṁ padārthasaṁsargarūpavākyārthātiriktasya sahṛdayahṛdayarañjakasya vaktṛvivakṣāparyavasānasīmnaḥ. Vyaṅgyārthasya tatparyaviṣayatvāt sa eva tātparyārthaḥ. Tasya vyañjanāvṛttigamyatvena tadatiriktatadbodhakavṛttyantarakalpanāyā anyāyyatvāt.* (*Alaṅkāramaṇidarpaṇa, f.* 26a)

2. *Yatra vācyātiśāyivyaṅgyasadbhāvastatra vyaṅgye tātparyaviśrāntiḥ. Yatra tu tādṛśārthābhāvastatra vacyārtha eva tātparyagraha iti kutrāpi virodhābhāvaḥ.* (*Ibid., f.* 26a).

Tātparyavṛtti, since *Abhidhā* itself accomplishes this purpose. This is a good point in the context stated above.

Acyutarāya, on the other hand, accepts *Abhihitānvayavāda* and in effect accepts *Tātparyavṛtti* also in poetry like Abhinavagupta and others. In this context, he contributes a special but queer point by way of bringing out the distinct feature of *śābdabodha* in poetry. In *Śāstras*, *śābdabodha* cannot arise without *yogyatā*. But in poetry, it can arise without *yogyatā* as in *mukhameva induḥ*.[1] This charming *śābdabodha* reveals itself only to the *Sahṛdayas*.

(iv) *Vyañjanā*

Finally, as regards *Vyañjanā* as a special *vṛtti* in poetry, the contribution of the writers of this period is in the direction of adducing some additional arguments to defend Vyañjanā as a separate function. Veṅkāmātya's additional arguments are implied from the instances of *Alaṅkāradhvani* supplementing the concise points made by Mammaṭa through instances of *Vastudhvani* and *Rasadhvani* only. In the instances of *Alaṅkāradhvani* it is particularly shown how *Pakṣatā* of the *Anumānavādin* cannot be maintained.

---

1. *Mukhamevenduityādāvālaṅkārikadarśane*
Śābdabodhaścamatkārī yogyatāvirahe' pi yaḥ
Sa tu tacchāstrasaṁskāravatāmevopajāyate
(*Sāhityasāra*, II. 30-31)

Acyutarāya considers another aspect of the problem, i.e., the inclusion of *Vyañjanā* in *Lakṣaṇā* itself and contributes his own point in support of Mammata's view distinguising *Vyañjanā* from *Lakṣaṇā*. Taking the well-known instance of *gaṅgāyāṁ ghoṣaḥ*, Acyutarāya rejects *visible Lakṣaṇā* on the ground that the sense, i.e., *sacredness of the bank* cannot arise prior to the knowledge of the indicated sense in the form of the bank. This is an additional argument supplementing Mammaṭa's argument, viz., the idea of the bank is the *viṣaya* of *Lakṣaṇā* and that of sacredness in the *phala* of this knowledge. Mammaṭa contends that the *phala* of knowledge is conveyed by a function different from the one required for conveying the *viṣaya*. Acyutarāya adds the argument that two senses arising one after the other cannot be governed by the same *Vyāpāra*.[1] The sense of secredness requires *Vyañjanā* as necessarily as the sense of the bank requires *Lakṣaṇā* to operate.

Thus the writers of this period contribute to the elucidation of the topic of *Śabdavyāpāra* by making some special points by way of explaining, clarifying and supporting the points of view of the authorties such as Mammaṭa and Vidyānātha in the discussion of the major problems connected with *Śabdavyāpāras*.

1. *Tasmādgaṅgāpade tīra eva grāhyātra lakṣaṇā*
Pavanatve tu satkāryā vyañjanaiva vipaścitā
(*Ibid.*, II. 123)

Classification of *Kāvya*

Most of the writers of 18th and 19th centuries accept the three- fold classification of *Kāvya* into *Dhvani, Guṇībhūtavyaṇgya* and *Citra*. These are the *Uttama, Madhyama* and *Adhama* types of *Kāvya* described by Mammaṭa and others. Two writers of the period, viz., Lakṣmaṇakavi and Acyutarāya broadly accept the classificatin of *Kāvya* according to Jagannātha. Lakṣmaṇakavi advocates the case of a fifth variety of *Kāvya* which exclusively consists in *verbal charm*. This is called *Adhamādhama*. In advocating it, he is impelled by an urge to give the designation of *Kāvya* to such *monosyllabic verses, Ardhavṛtti-yamaka* and *Citrabandhas* as are found in *Kirātārjunīyam* and *Śiśupālavadha*, in spite of the warning sounded by Jagannātha against it.[1] Acyutarāya, on the other hand, gives classification of *Kāvya*, finally amounting to that of Jagannātha. He starts with the broad classification of *Kāvya* into *Sarasa* and *Citra*. He brings *Dhvani* and *Guṇībhūtavyaṅgya* under *Sarasa*. These are called *Uttamottama* and *Uttama*. Under *Citra* he brings in *Arthacitra* and *Śabdacitra*. These are *Madhyama* and

1. *Śabdasya śābdabodhe prakāratayā bhāsanenā-rthatvāṅgī kathamanyathā 'udbhidā yajeta' ityādāvapīva 'nāmadheyaṁ syad yadutpattāvapūrva-mabhidhāyakatvāt' iti sūtre udbhinnāmadheyena yāgeneṣṭaṁ bhāvayedityartho budhyeta.... Tasmācchābda-bodhasya camatkārakatvāt kāvyasya pañcavidhatvaṁ siddham.*

(*Śāhabhūpālaṅkāra, f.2a*)

Adhama. Thus in the final analysis these types of *Kāvya* correspond to Jagannātha's four kinds of *Kāvya*.

(a) *Dhvanikāvya*

The best variety *Kāvya* is *Dhvani*. *Ālaṅkārikas* of the period under enquiry take the defintion of *Dhvanikāvya* according to Mammaṭa and contribute some of their points by way of elucidating the views of the authorities of the *Dhvani* school. The criterion of demarcating *Dhvanikāvya* and *Guṇībhūtavyaṅgyakāvya* is comparative excellence of the expressed sense and the suggested sense. Kṛṣṇāvadhūta Paṇḍita in his *Kāvyalakṣaṇasaṅgraha*, makes a very illuminating observation regarding the judgement of comparative excellence of these two senses. He elucidates the point by saying that this judgement rests with the *sahṛdayas*:

Sahṛdayānām alocanasādhyatvaṁ prādhānyam.[1]

when the suggested sense is so assessed by the sahṛdayas as surpassing the expressed sense in point of charm, it constitutes Dhvani-kāvya.

As regards the classification of *Dhvani*, the *Alaṅkāra* writers of this period follow Mammaṭa, Vidyānātha and Jagannātha. Only a few writers such as Rājaśekhara, the author of *Sāhityakalpadruma*, and Acyutarāya closely adhere to the classification of *Dhvani* according to

1. *Kāvyalakṣaṇasaṅgraha, f. la.*

Mammaṭa. Others show a tendency of reducing the number of *Dhvani* varieties on certain grounds. Narasiṁha, Veṅkāmātya, Viśveśvara Paṇḍita, Rāmasudhī and Kṛṣṇāvadhūta Paṇḍita follow Jagannātha in reducing the number of *śuddhadhvani* varieties and Vidyānātha as well as Sudhīndrayogin in reducing the number of *Miśradhvan*i varieties. Only the major tendencies are mentioned here : (1) The rejection of *Kavinibaddhavaktṛprauḍhoktisiddha* varieties of *Arthaśakti-mūladhvani;* (ii) the rejection of *Sajātīya-saṅkara* and *Sajātīya- saṁsṛṣṭi* varieties of *Miśra-dhvani.*

Kṛṣṇāvadhūta Paṇḍita, in his *Kāvyalakṣaṇasaṅgraha,* scores a deviation from all the writers of the Mammaṭa era and those of the 18th and 19th centuries in one aspect, i.e., in respect of counting the eight *Rasādidhvani* forms of *Dhvani* (*Rasa, Bhāva, Rasābhāsa, Bhāvābhāsa,* etc.), as separate varieties. All the other writers count *Rasādidhvani* as one variety only. Thus Kṛṣṇāvadhūta introduces the prolixity of counting 48 varieties of *Rasādidhvani.*[1] Hence, what is gained in the direction of reducing the number of *Dhvani* varieties by way of rejecting the varieties mentioned above is lost in the process of inroducing hair-splitting classification of *Rasādidhvani.*

---

1. Ibid., f.8a.

Rasādidhvani

Rasādidhvani occupies the most important position in the scheme of poetics, particularly after it was ably elucidated by Abhinavagupta. Deriving the inspiration from the *Dhvani* theorists, Abhinavagupta discoverd the right key in *Vyañjanā* to unravel the mystery of *Rasa*-realisation hitherto hidden in the vagueness of Bharata's famous *Rasasūtra*, and formulated his *Vyaktivāda*. All the writers of the 18th and 19th centuries dealing with *Rasa* either in their comprehensive treatises along with other topics or in independent works, take Abhinavagupta's *Vyaktivāda* as the theoretical basis of their thinking on *Rasa*. With their conception of *Ra*sa firmly anchored on this foundation, they undertake the task of restating the details of *Rasa* that developed from the time of Bharata to the time of Jagannātha. The details pertain to *Sthāyibhāva*, i.e., the *Rasa* in its rudimentary form and *Vibhāva*, *Anubhāva*, *Sattvikabhāva* and *Vyabhicāribhāva*, i.e., the accessories that transform the *Sthāyibhāva* into *Rasa*. It is in the presentation of these details that they contribute their special points. These special points are to be traced in the discussions on some of the problems on the *nature*, *substratum* and *number* of *Rasas* as well as on the mutual differentiating features of the accessories of *Rasa* such as *Vibhāvas*, *Anubhāvas*, *Vyabhicāribhāvas*, etc.

Nature of *Rasa*

First, as regards the nature of *Rasa*, same rethinking is evident in these writers. For instance, Veṅkāmātya provides a significant rethinking when he defines *Rasa* as *Sthāyibhāva* itself.[1] Thus he goes a step further from the stand of the earlier authorities that the *Sthāyibhāva* is an immediataly preceding stage of *Rasa*-experience. What is significant is Veṅkāmātya's implication that in regard to a psychological process like the *Rasa*-experience, it is difficult to mark the *pūrvāvasthā*, *aparāvasthā* and the like. Then he takes a technical objection to the use of the terms *Vibhāva*, *Anubhāva*, etc., in a definition of *Raṣa*. These constitute the *rasasāmagrī* bringing the *Sthāyibhāva* to the relish of the *sahṛdayas*. Here he implies that the definitions of *Rasa* given by the earlier writers containing these terms, are only apt to describe how *Rasa*- experience arises but not to bring out the nature of *Rasa*-experience itself.[2] The only apt way to describe the nature of *Rasa* is to describe it as the *Sthāyibhāva*,

---

1. *Rasatvaṁca sthāyibhāvatvam.*
Sāmājikamanovikāraviśeṣo brahmānandasabrahmacāri rasātmakasthāyibhāva eva lakṣaṇaghaṭitasthāyiśabdena vivakṣitaḥ.
(Alaṅkāramaṇidarpaṇa, f. 44- b-45a)

2. *Rasateḥ svadanārthatvādrasyanta iti rasā iti rasasya vibhāvānubhāvasāttvikavyabhicāriṇāṁ sāmājikāsvādanasāmagrīpradarśanavidhayā rasasvarūpapratipādanaparaṁ, na lakṣaṇaparam*
(Ibid., f. 45a).

the nature of which is already well known in the writers like Dhanañjaya, Vidyānātha and others. Cirañjīva Bhaṭṭācārya seems to imply the same when he says that *Rasas* are the *Pariṇāmas* of the *Sthāyibhāvas.*[1]

Another point of rethinking is evident in the definitions of *Rasa* by Acyutarāya Moḍak and Śrīśaila Veṅkaṭācārya. This rethinking is rooted in Jagannātha's definition of *Rasa*. These definitions employ the terms *Vibhāva, Anubhāva,* etc., as connoting the circumstances required for removing the veil of ignorance in the form of *self-centred attitude* obscuring the innate bliss of the soul.[2] When the veil of ignorance is removed, the soul experiences its own bliss through the relish of the *Sthāyibhāva* in the form of *Rati, Hāsa,* etc. (*Cidvedyaḥ sthāyyasau rasaḥ*). This is the substance of Jagannatha's first definition of *Rasa*. The special point of Acyutarāya is by way of clarifying the

---

1. *Eta eva sthāyibhāvā vibhāvādyaih paripūrṇā rasarūpatvena pariṇamanti, yathā suvarṇādayaḥ Kuṇḍalāditveneti* (*Kāvyavilāsa*, p.4)
2. *Vibhāvādyairapājñānacidvedyaḥ sthāyyasau resaḥ Tatsaṁyutivyaktasthāyyupādhiścideva rasaḥ* (*Sāhityasāra*, IV.14).
   (Vibhāvādibhiḥ) saṁbhūya kaścitpramātṛgataḥ punaralaukiko vyāpāraḥ samutpadyate, tena cākhaṇḍānandāvarakamajñānam apasāryate. Apasṛte cātmacaitanyāvaraṇe svaprakāśena nijasvarūpānandena saha pramātrā puruṣeṇa ratyādisthāyī gocarīkriyate.
   (*Rasacandrikā of Śrīśaila Veṅkaṭācārya*, f.14)

substance of Jagannātha's definition. He clarifies that *cidvedyatva* means *sthāyyupādhiḥ cideva resaḥ*, i.e., *Rasa* is *cit* itself characterised by the *Sthāyin* manifested by the harmonious blending of *Vibhāvas*, *Anubhāvas*, etc. This amounts to the second definition of *Rasa* given by Jagannātha. The doctrinal basis of the view, as explained by Acyutarāya, is the *Upaniṣadic* statement *Raso vai saḥ*. The same doctrinal basis is evident in the definition of *Rasa* given by Veṇkaṭācārya. Thus following the *navya* view of Jagannātha Acyutarāya and Veṅkaṭācārya speak of the removal of ignorance as a pre-condition for the enjoyment of bliss in the *Rasa*-experinence as in the *Mokṣa*-experience. Veṅkaṭācārya's interpretation of *cidviśiṣṭatva* is slightly different. He explains it as the realisation of the *Sthāyin* (*Rati*, etc.,) by the Self (*Pramātṛ-Puruṣa*) along with its intrinsic nature of bliss when the veil of ignorance is removed by the poetic means. Thus he closely follows Jagannātha, while Acyutarāya thinks of a clarification that *cit* itself charactẹrised by the *Sthāyin* is *Rasa*. The difference lies in accounting for the blissful experience that arises. According to the older view, *Rasa* is blissful because the *sthāyin* is illumined by *Sākṣi-cit* whose content is bliss, while according to Acyutarāya, it is blissful because *Sākṣi*-cit whose content is bliss is itself *Rasa*. Thus Acyutarāya closely follows Jagannātha.

One of the purposes served by this rethinking is, according to Acyutarāya, that the conception of *Rasa* would conform to the *Upaniṣadic* statements and would thus be acceptable to the *Brahmavits*. Veṇkaṭācārya, on the other hand, is keen on distinguishing *Rasa*-experience from Brahma experience when he says *cidviśiṣṭaḥ sthāyī rasaḥ* instead of saying *cideva rasaḥ*.

Rasāśraya

As regards the question as to whose experience the *Rasa* is, all the writers of this period unanimously accept the traditional view that *Rasa* is the the experience of the *sahṛdaya* alone, but not of either the *anukārya (hero)* or the actor. Thus these writers differ from Vidyānātha, who holds that *Rasa* is the experience of the hero, (i.e., *anukārya*). But his conception of *Rasāśraya*, as explained by Kumārasvāmin, pertains to what is known as *Laukikarasa*. This should be distinguished from the *Alaukikarasa*, which is exclusively the experience of the *sahṛdayas*. *Nāyaka* is the substratum of the *Laukikarasa* which induces pleasure or sorrow in him, while *sahṛdaya* alone is the substratum of the *Alaukikarasa*, which brings only bliss and nothing else. This is the substance of the stand of 18th and 19th century writers on the question of *Rasāśraya*. Yet, some writers provide certain special points to this question.

Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa, for instance, provides some rethinking on this point under the influence of the *Kṛṣṇabhakti* cult to which he belonged. In the case of *Śṛṅgāra* and other *Rasas* pertaining to ordinary heroes, Baladeva accepts the *sahṛdaya* as the only *āśraya*. But in the case of *Bhagavadrati* such as the *rati* of the *Gopikās* for Kṛṣṇa, the *anukārya* can as well be the *āśraya* because the *Vibhāvas*, etc., are not *laukika* at all.[1]

Further Kṛṣṇāvadhūta Paṇḍita makes some significant observations on the question of *Rasāśraya*. He discusses the point with his logical skill and comes to the conclusion that nobody can be strictly spoken of as the *āśraya* of *Rasa*. *Anukārya* belongs to the past. *Naṭa* portrays the roles through instruction and practice. *Sahṛdaya* has no object for his feelings. Hence none of these is the *āśraya* of *Rasa*. What Kṛṣṇāvadhūta Paṇḍita means to say is that *Rasāśraya* should be distinguished from *Rasāsvādāśraya* and in the latter sense alone the *sahṛdaya* is regarded as the *āśraya* but not in the former sense.[2] All writers on *Rasa* generally speak

---

1. *Laukikatvādihetuvirahādiha anukāryādiṣvapi rasaḥ.*
(*Sāhityakaumudī*, p.29).

2. *Sahṛdayairevāsvādyamānālaukikasyāśrayo naṭa iti cenna, śikṣābhyāsavaiyarthyāt, nāyikāyā naṭaratyaviṣayatvācca. Anukārya iti ced atītatvāt. Nirviṣayatvāpatterna sāmājikaḥ. Buddhyārūḍhasvakāntādayo viṣaya iti ced anubhavavirodhāt, pūrvottarānusandhānācca. Sphaṭike japārāgavanmanasi pratiphalite tadāśrayatvamiti cetsiddharasasyābhāvāt.*
(*Sārasvatālaṅkārasūtrāṇi*, V-i. 29- 35).

of the *sahṛdaya* as the *āśraya* of *Rasa* without making any difference between *Rasāśraya* and *Rasāsvādāśraya*. Kṛṣṇāvadhūta's special point is that he makes this difference and observes that the *sahṛdaya* is the *Rasāsvādāśraya* but not the *Rasāśraya*. However, it is a moot point as to how a distinction can be made between *Rasa* and *Rasāsvāda*.

Number of *Rasas*

On the question of the number of *Rasas*, the writers of these centuries generally accept the traditional view, i.e., the theory of *nine Rasas*. Only one writer of the Period called Nṛsiṁhasudhī, the author of *Alaṅkārasāra*, deviates from the tradition of nine *Rasas*. He follows Bhoja and Siṁhabhūpāla in advocating *Śṛṅgāra* as the only *Rasa*.[1] In spite of their adherence to the tradition of *nine Rasas* in deference to the authorities like Abhinavagupta, Mammaṭa and others, some writers show an inclination to accept other *Rasas* such as *Bhakti*, *Dāsya*, *Sakhya*, *Vātsalya*. For instance Acyutarāya shows some partiality to *Bhaktirasa*[2] and Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa is inclined to accept other *Rasas*,

---

1. *Sa ca rasaḥ śṛṅgāra eka eva. Itare hāsaśokādayo bhāvā eva.* (*Alaṅkārasāra*, f. la)
2. Acyutarāya classifies *Bhakti* as *Parā* and *Aparā* and considers the former as *Rasa* and the latter as *Bhāva*: *Tathā ca ko virodho' tra bhaktālaṅkārikādhvanoḥ; Avarā vyabhicāritvādbhaktir bhāvostu kā kṣatiḥ.* (*Sāhityasāra*, IV. 137).

Bhakti, etc.[1] Yet these writers do not make up their mind about these *Rasas*, although they do not reject their claims to be *Rasas*. All other writers accept the nine-*Rasa* stand and by way of defending this stand, they discuss the claims of other *Rasas* such as *Māyā* and reject them with arguments. They also consider the arguments against *Śāntarasa* and refute them. These are generally the restatements of the discussions made by the earlier authorities such as Mammaṭa. Yet in the exposition of these, the writers of the period under enquiry contribute some points of their own by way of explaining and elucidating the arguments far and against the problems.

Śṛṅgāraikarasavāda

The main target of their attack is the *Śṛṅgāraikarasavāda*. Veṅkāmātya puts some dialectical questions to divine the ground of denying the status of *Rasa* to *Hāsya, Karuṇa,* etc. The grounds should be any one of these : (i) the absence of the quality of relish in them, (ii) not coming to the experience of all, (iii) the absence of *Sthāyibhāvas* exclusive of *Rati,* (iv) not being predominent. None of these grounds can be satisfactorily established in view of the accepted stand of the authorities.

---

1. *Nanu dāsyasakhyavātsalyākhyāstraya rasāḥ Pare santyanubhūyante ca tajjñaistataḥ kathamatra navaiveti cet, satyam. Tathāpi nātra te nirūpyante. Navaiva rasāḥ, pare tu bhāvāḥ iti svatantrecchena muninā paribhāṣaṇāt* (*Sāhityakaumudī, pp.110-112*)

Hāsya and others have the quality of relish in them. They are universally experienced by the *sahṛdayas*. They have their own *Sthāyibhāvas*. The question of predominance is not the right criterion to judge. The main ground of the *Śṛṅgāraikarasavādins* represented by Nṛsiṁhasudhī of this period, is that *Hāsa*, etc., do not have the quality of relish and they can at best be *Bhāvas* only. However, this ground is firmly rejected by Veṅkāmātya in the above refutation. Some people may be immune to the relish of these. But the universal experience of the *Sahṛdayas* confirms the quality of relish in them. This is the reason why the *Śṛṅgāraikarasavāda* does not have many supporters.

Māyārasavāda

Next comes the case of *Māyārasa* advocated by Bhānudatta. Cirañjīva Bhaṭṭācārya, Viśveśvara Paṇḍita, Ghāsī Rāma Paṇḍita, etc., discuss this problem in detail. Cirañjīva adduces three important argumets against the claims of *Māyā* as a *Rasa:* (1) *Māyā* is beginningless; (2) *Māyā* is the cause of *Mithyājñāna* and the claim that *Mithyājñāna* is the *sthāyin* is against the *Śāstras;* (3) *Rasa* is *Brahman* and *Māyā* is its opposite. Here the third argument is based on the *Upaniṣadic* statement *Raso vai saḥ.*[1]

---

1. *Mithyājñānamātrasthāyibhāvaḥ, sāṁsārikabhoga-dharmādharmādirvibhāvaḥ, putrakalatrarājyādir anubhāvaḥ, manorathādirvyabhicāribhāvaḥ, iti vadanti and its refutation.* *(Kāvyavilāsa, p.10).*

Viśveśvara Paṇḍita rejects *Māyā* on the ground (i) that *Mithyājñāna* is always *prabuddha* and *Rasa* arises only through the apprehension of *vibhāvas, Anubhāvas*, etc., and (ii) that there can be no regularity regarding its *sthāyitva* or *vyabhicāritva*.[1] The same arguments are adduced by Ghāsī Rāma Paṇḍita.[2] Both the writers examine the contention of the Māyārasavādins that *Māyā* is to be accepted as much in *pravṛtti* as *Śānta* is accepted in *nivṛtti*. This contention is automatically rejected by the arguments already adduced. Ghāsī Rāma Paṇḍita, in particular, has suggested an alternative position for *Māyā* by recommending its inclusion in *Adbhutarasa* without realising that he is nullifying the strength of his own arguments against its *rasatva*.

Bhaktirasavāda

The question of *Bhaktirasa* deserves special attention because some writers of the period show some partiality towards it. *Madhusūdana* Kavīndra's conception of *Vaiṣṇavaśṛṅgāra* with *Śrī Kṛṣṇa* as the sole hero and *Gopis* as the heroines,[3] is the same as *Madhurā Bhakti* of Rūpa Gosvāmin who gives an

---

1. *Rasacandrikā, p.18.*
2. *Rasasya kādācitkatayā mithyājñānasya sarvada pravṛttatvena tadabhāvāpatteḥ. Rasasādhāraṇa-kāraṇībhūtavyabhicāriṇām anupapatteśca. Māyāyā adbhutarūpatvena adbhutentarbhāvasya vaktuṁ śakyatvāt* (*Rasakaumudī, f. 14b-15a*).
3. *Rasacandrikā, II. 1.* (*Madhusūdana*).

exposition of it in his *Bhaktirasāmṛtasindhu* and *Ujjvalanīlamaṇi. Acyutarāya, on the other hand classifies Bhakti* into *parā* and *Amukhyā*. He considers *Amukhyā Bhakti* as a *Bhāva* and *Parā Bhakti* as one with *Śānta*. It is interesting to note that Acyutarāya is trying to bridge the difference between *Bhaktirasavādins* and *Ālaṅkārikas*. Other writers of the period bring it under *Devādiviṣayaka-ratibhāva,* as they do in the case of *Sneha, Vātsalya, Sakhya,* etc.

Defence of *Śānta*

This is a very important discussion from the point of view of *Navarasavādins*. The arguments of the opponents of *Śānta* are examined and rejected to establish it as the *ninth Rasa*. The attempt has been from the time of Ānandavardhana. Mammaṭa gives sound arguments in defence of *Śānta*. The writers of 18th and 19th centuries summerise these arguments and discuss some fresh aspects of the problem. They elaborate on the question whether *Śānta* should be accepted in *Śravyakāvya* only or in both *Śravya* and *Dṛśya Kāvyas*. Veṅkāmātya adduces some additional arguments in support of the view that *Śānta* should be accepted in *Śravyakāvya* as well as *Dṛśyakāvya*. He refers to such Dramas as *Prabodhacandrodaya, Caitanyacandrodaya,* etc., to show that *Śānta* which comes to the experience of some magnanimous persons should not be rejected. Viśveśvara Paṇḍita in particular contributes a very good point in the same connection. He shows that

according to Bharata, *Nirveda* arises from several conditions, viz., *dāridrya, nyakkāra, vyādhi, apamāna, krodha,* etc., as well as *tattvajñāna*. Then he comments : *Nirveda* arising from *dāridrya, nyakkāra,* etc., may be considered as the *Vyabhicaribhāva* of *Śṛṅgāra,* etc. But *Nirveda* arising from *tattvajñāna* in the form of *nityānityaviveka* cannot be considered as a *Vyabhicārin* of any of the *Rasas*. Hence this must be accepted as the *Sthāyin* of *Śānta*.[1] This proves the necessity of accepting *Śānta* as a separate *Rasa*. This also shows the tenability of the argument that Bharata, who places it at the head of the *Vyabhicāribhāvas,* immediately after *Sthāyibhāvas,* means to sanction it as a *Sthāyibhāva* also.

Mutual differentiation of the accessories of *Rasa,* viz., *Vibhāva, Anubhāva,* etc.

Other details presented by the writers of this period are in the direction of explaining mutual differences among the accessories of *Rasa* such as *Vibhāva, Anubhāva,* etc. : (1) The most important discussion that engages the attention is the one regarding the difference between *Anubhāvas* and *Sāttvikabhāvas*. Veṅkāmātya admits that *Sāttvikabhāvas* are *Anubhāvas* since they are the external manifestation of inner feelings. Yet on the subtle ground that they arise from *sattva,* i.e., the mental dispositon of the *sahṛdaya* in response to the feelings of others, he distinguishes them from

1. *Rasacandrikā* (Viśveśvara), pp. 66-68.

the *Anubhāvas*.[1] The *Avaloka* on *Daśarūpaka* gives the explanation of the term *sattva*. Veṅkāmātya presses it into service in anticipating an objection and answering it in this connection. (2) Similarly *Sāttvikabhāvas* are differentiated by Vaṅkāmātya from *Vyabhicāribhāvas* on the ground that the former are the external effects, while the latter are their internal causes.[2] (3) Veṅkāmātya and Vaṅkaṭācārya (Śrīśaila) discuss a very interesting point as regards side-glances, etc., as to whether they are *Uddīpanavibhāvas* or *Anubhāvas*. These are generally taken as *Anubhāvas*. They make an observation that these are *Anubhāvas* as well as *Uddīpanavibhāvas* from different points of view. They are *Anubhāvas* from the point of view of the *Nāyikā*, while they are *Uddīpanavibhāvas* from the point of view of the *Nāyaka*.

Other Important points on *Rasa*

(1) Acyutarāya gives a novel classification of *Rasa* as *Sāttvika*, *Rājasa*, and *Tāmasa*. *Śānta*, *Śṛṅgāra*

---

1. *Abhinayādimukhenānyagatasukhaduḥkhabhāvanāyām antaḥkaraṇānukūlyaṁ sattvam. Tato bhavaḥ Sāttvikaḥ.... Stambhādīnām anubhāvatvāviśeṣe'pi sattvajatvātteṣām pṛthaṅnirdeśa iti veditavyam (Alaṅkāramaṇidarpaṇa, f. 50b-51a).*

2. *Ratinirvedasūcakāḥ bāhyāḥ stambhādayaḥ sāttvikabhāvāḥ 'Āntarā nirvedādayaḥ' ityanena sāttvikānāṁ stambhādīnāṁ nirvedādīnāṁ ca sāttvikatvāviśeṣepi bāhyānāṁ stambhādīnām āṇtarālikanirvedādikāryatayā kāryakāraṇabhāvavailakṣaṇyāttayor bhedonusandheyaḥ. (Ibid., f. 53a)*

and *Karuṇa* are brought under *Sāttvika* group. *Hāsya, Adbhuta* and *Bhayānaka* form *Rājasa* group. *Vīra, Bībhatsa* and *Raudra* belong to *Tāmasa* group. The *Rasas* in each group are called *Sāttvika-sāttvika*, *Sāttvika-rājasa* and *Sāttvika-tāmasa*, and so on.[1] Here Acyutaraya follows the model of classification of *Jāgrat, Svapna* and *Suṣupti* given by Madhusūdana Sarasvatī in *Siddhāntabindu*.

(2) Cirañjīva Bhaṭṭācārya and Śrīśaila Veṅkaṭācārya discuss the difference between *Vipralambha Śṛṅgāra* and *Karuṇa*.[2] Both the *Rasas* are delineated through lamentations, weeping and such other features. The main point of difference is that in *Vipralambha* grief is associated with *Rati*, while in *Karuṇa* it is unalloyed with *Rati*. Śrīśaila Veṅkaṭācārya, in particular, advocates a separate *Rasa* called *Karuṇavipralambha* illustrating it with instances taken from the *Rāmāyaṇa* and the *Kādambarī*.[3]

(3) Madhusūdana *Kavīndra* considers *Śṛṅgāra* as the principal *Rasa*,[4] other *Rasas* treated as secondary *Rasas*.

---

1. *Sāhityasāra, p.103; Com. on IV.48.*
2. *Kāvyavilāsa, pp. 10-11; Rasacandrika, f. 28-29.*
3. *Tatra vinigamanavirahеṇa ratiśokayorubhayo-rapi prādhānyāt, ubhṇyasthāyikaḥ karuṇavipra-lambhaḥ atirikta eva rasaḥ* (*Rasacandrikā, f.29*).
4. *Sarvapradhānaṁ śṛṅgāro vistarāt sa hi varṇyate* (*Rasacandrikā, I.18*).

(4) Baladeva Vidābhūṣaṇa classifies *Ālambana-vibhāva* into *Viṣayālambana* and *Āṣrayālambana.*[1] The former is the person regarding whom some feeling is stirred and the latter stands for the person experiencing *Rati,* etc. Veṅkāmātya actually analyses the *Ālambana-vibhāva* in his illustrations always in the latter sense.[2]

(5) Regarding *Bhāva,* Baladeva observes that *devādivisayakarati* is *Bhāva*. But this *Rati* for Kṛṣṇa on the part of the *Gopikās* is always *Śṛṅgārarasa.*[3]

Thus the writers of 18th and 19th centuries accept the *Vyaktivāda* of Abhinavagupta as the basis of their thinking and contribute some points of their own by way of explaining, discussing the important topics under *Rasa*. Their points on the nature, substratum and the number of *Rasas* are not mere reproductions of the views of the earlier authorities, but reveal a lot of rethinking on their part.

Guṇa

The concept of *Guṇa* receives a new perspective in the hands of *Dhvani* theorists. It is divorced of its earlier association with *Rīti* which it had in

---

1. *Sāhityakaumudī, p.29.*
2. *Sadādhāraṁ dhīram, etc. depicting the Śūrpanakha's love for Rāma; here Śūrpanakha is taken as the Ālambanavibhāva, but not Rāma. Thus Veṅkāmātya takes Ālambanavibhāva in the sense of āśrayālambana*
(Alaṅkāramaṇidarpaṇa, f.57b and 58a).
3. *Sāhityakaumudī,p.49.*

the treatment of Daṇḍin and Vāmana. *Guṇas* in the new setting came to be established the attributes of *Rasa*, rather than of *Śabda*, *Artha* or *Rīti*. They evolve out of the coherence of syllables or words and aim at producing the mental condition appropriate for the different *Rasas*. Since they evolve out of the appropriate arrangement of syllables or words, they are said the reside in *Saṅghaṭanā*. Both these layers of thought about *Guṇas*, i.e., *rasadharmatva* and *saṅghaṭanāśrayatva*, constitute Vidyānātha's conception of *Guṇa*, which the writers of 18th and 19th centuries inherit. Like Vidyānātha, they revive the pre-*dhvani* associations of *Guṇas* other than *Mādhurya*, *Ojas* and *Prasāda* and treat these as the general excellences of poetic composition. *Mādhurya*, *Ojas* and *Prasāda* are, however, called as *rasadharmas*. Yet, in the treatment of these, they do not give any special attention to relate them to *Rasas*. Following Mammaṭa and Vidyānātha, they classify *Guṇas* into (i) positive entities such as *Mādhurya*, etc., and (ii) negations of *Doṣas*, for instance, *Śleṣa*, etc. Following Vidyānātha, in the particular, they explain 24 *Guṇas* of Bhoja.

Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa alone deals with ten *Guṇas* of Daṇḍin. Thus the writers of this period closely follow Vidyānātha in the treatment of *Guṇas*. Yet, in the exposition of these, some writers contribute their points by way of supporting the stand of certain earlier writers or deviating from certain others in a few details.

Kṛṣṇasudhī, the author of *Kāvyakalānidhi*, has made a two-fold contribution to the elucidation of the concept of *Guṇa*. First he gives a clear exposition of Mammaṭa's criticism of Vāmana's conception of *Guṇa* as the attribute of *Rīti*. He supports the arguments of Mammaṭa by way of interpreting his illustrations. For instance, he shows that the stanza, *Svargaprāptiranenaiva*, etc., quoted by Mammaṭa as an instance lacking in *Guṇas*, contains *Viśeṣokti* and *Vyatireka* as its points of charm.[1] This illumines the real point in Mammaṭa's argument. The point is that *Vāmana* thinks of *Alaṅkāras* as certain factors enhancing the appeal of poetry created by *Guṇas*. In the instance concerned, the *Alaṅkāras* do not have any *Guṇas* to serve. They enhance the charm of poetic speech by themselves. Hence *Vāmana's* definition of *Guṇa* was not acceptable to Mammaṭa. This point is made clear by Kṛṣṇasudhī by interpreting the illustrative stanza given by Mammaṭa.

The second point contributed by Kṛṣṇasudhī is by way of deviating from the stand of his own ancestor, Jagannātha Paṇḍita who feels that there is no necessity of any *Upacāra* for applying the

---

1. *Kāvyakalānidhi*, Chapter VIII, p.309-*Atra pūrvārdhe yatkiñcaikaguṇahānikalpanāyā sāmyādārthyaṁ viśeṣoktir, uttarārdhe adharaḥ sudhāṁ nyakkarotīti tato'pi viśeṣapratīter vyatirekālaṅkāraḥ. Tau ca guṇanirapekṣāveva kāvyavyavahāraṁ pradarśyata iti nirvivādam. Tataśca guṇānāmeva kāvyaśobhāhetutve, tatra guṇābhāvena kāvyaśobhāyā abhāvāt, kathaṁ viśeṣoktivyatirekayostadatiśayahetutvam.*

terms *Madhura,* etc., to *Śabda* and *Artha*. Thus Jagannātha has rejected the view of Mammaṭa to that effect. Kṛṣṇasudhī opposes Jagannātha's view and re-establishes the necessity of *Upacāra* in this context with some of his special arguments in support of Mammaṭa's view. The primary application of the terms *Madhura,* etc., to syllables, words or senses is not tenable because syllables, etc., are infinite. Only secondarily these terms are applied to syllables, etc., just as joy and the like that really belong the the soul, are spoken with reference to the body, etc.[1]

The above discussion amounts to the question whether *Gunas* are *rasadharmas* or *śabdārthadharmas*. Kṛṣṇasudhī concurs with Mammaṭa's stand that they are primarily *rasadharmas*. Acyutarāya also discusses this question and supports Mammaṭa's stand. His contribution lies in answering Jagannātha's arguments against Mammaṭa's stand. The main argument of Jagannātha is that *Guṇas* are not inferred from the effects of the *Rasa*-experience, because *Rasas* themselves are the causes of the various shades of these effects. The process of inferring *Guṇas* as above involves *gaurava*.

---

1. *Ibid.,* Chap..VIII. p.305 *Varṇānāmānantyāttadvṛttitve gauravāt. Atra śabdo madhuro nārthaḥ iti vyavahārāt śabdārthobhayavṛttitayā mādhuryasyaikasya vyavahartumaśakyatvāt. Ato rasamātragataṁ mādhuryamekameva paramparāsambandhena sukhamātmaniṣṭhaṁ śarīrādiṣ- viva varṇādiṣvapi bhātīti niravadyam.*

Acyutarāya argues that it does not involve such a *doṣa* because the three *Guṇas* are inferred as the causes of only three effects of *Rasa*-experiece, viz., *cittadruti, cittadīpti* and *rasavyāpana*.[1] Rejecting another argument of Jagannātha, he says that it is not necessary to think of *Madhura, madhuratara, Madhuratama,* and so on to account for the various shades of effects produced by the different *Rasas*. Just as the quantity of fire is in direct proportion to the quantity of the thing to be burnt, the depth of *Mādhurya* is in proportion to the intensity of the effect. This happens in a natural course. Hence there is no necessity of such technical distinctions.[2] Another argument of Jagannātha, viz., that a *Guṇa* cannot be an attribute of another *Guṇa* like *Rasa*, is rejected on the ground that *Guṇas* of the *Ālaṅkārikas* should not be treated on par with *Rūpa, Rasa, Gandha,* etc., of the *Naiyāyikas*.[3] These are the important points contributed by Acyutarāya in support of Mammaṭa's stand by way of answering the arguments of Jagannātha.

It may be observed here that Acyutarāya's conception of *Guṇas* as *rasadharmas* in the present context is without prejudice to his broad conception of *Guṇa* so as to include *Rasa, Alaṅkāra,* etc., because

---

1. *Drutyādijanakatve tadvatvenaiva lāghavāt*
   (Sāhityasāra, VII.128, Com.on p.325)
2. *Ibid., VII.130.*
3. *Prakṛte hi guṇapadena dharma eveṣṭaḥ na tu tārkikādivad rūpādyaḥ* *(Ibid., P.327)*

the term *Guṇa* is used by him both in its broad and narrow senses, just as the term *Alaṅkāra* was employed by Daṇḍin and other early writers.

Thus the contribution of the writers of this period to the concept of *Guṇa* is in the direction of adducing new points and explaining the stand of Mammaṭa and other authorities, reviving in effect their stand against the criticism of Jagannātha. They provide some rethinking on the relation of *Guṇas* with *Rasa* via-a-vis *Śabda* and *Artha*.

Concepts of *Rīti, Vṛtti, Śayyā* and *Pāka*

Among the concepts constituting *kāvyasāmagrī*, the contribution of the writers of this period to the concept of *Guṇa* is presented above. Their contribution to the concept of *Alaṅkāra* will be subsequently estimated. Here the major points of their contribution to the concepts of *Rīti, vṛtti, Śayyā* and *Pāka* are presented. It is well known that the concepts of *Rīti, Vṛtti (Kaiśikī, etc.), Śayyā* and *Pāka* are revived and reinstated in a better perspective by Vidyānātha. This attempt is duly acknowledged by the writers of the period such as Narasiṁha, Veṅkāmātya, Kṛṣṇāvadhūta Paṇḍita, through giving a considerable importance to them in their works. Veṅkāmātya, in particular, has made a very important contribution in this direction. He has employed *Pūrvamīmāṁsā Nyāyas* for the elucidation of subtle differences among these concepts:

(i) *Alaṅkāras* are the attributes of *Śabda* and *Artha* (*aṅga-dharmas*), while *Vṛttis* such as *Kaiśikī* are the attributes of *Rasas* (i.e., *pradhānadharmas*), just as *avahanana, prokṣaṇa*, etc., belong to the accessory function of the main *Darśapūrṇamāsa* sacrifice and the rites like *Jyotiṣṭoma* pertain to the principal *Soma*-sacrifice.[1]

(ii) *Vṛtti* and *Rīti* differ by virtue of the results they produce, viz., *Vṛttis* suggest *Rasas*, while *Rītis* bring forth *Guṇas*. They also differ in respect of *āśraya*, i.e., *Vṛttis* pertain to *Artha* and *Rītis* pertain to *Śabda*. The *phalabheda* is shown on the analogy of the difference between *Ukthya* and *Atirātra* in respect of the fruit and the *āṣrayabheda* is shown on the analogy of *Yūpa* and *Abhiṣavaṇa* in *Paśuyāga* and *Somayāga*.[2]

---

1. *Jyotiṣṭomena yajeta ukthyena yajeta ityādiyāgaviśeṣāṇāṁ sākṣādapūrvotpādakatayā somādipradhānadharmāṇāṁ jyotiṣṭomokthyādi-somayāgaviśeṣāṇāmiva...sākṣādrasābhivyañjakānāṁ sukumārārthasandarbhādirūpāṇāṁ kaiśikyādīnāṁ kāvyapradhānabhūtaśṛṅgārādirasadharmatvam...alaṅkārāṇāṁ tu darśapūrṇamāsarūpapradhānāṅgalakṣaṇapuroḍāśasannāyyadharmāṇāmavahanana-prokṣaṇanirvāpādīnāmivarasāṅgabhūtaśabdārtha-dharmatvamiti pradhānadharmatvāṅgadharmatvavilakṣaṇamahattarabhedasya jāgarūkatayā.. ...bhedasaṁbhavāt.* (*Alaṅkāramaṇidarpaṇa*, f.11a-11b).

2. *Paśusomādivibhinnāśrayayor yūpābhiṣavaṇayoriva śabdārtharūpāśrayabhedena, vibhinnaphalayorukthyātirātrayoriva rasābhivyañjakatvarasasamavetamādhuryādyabhivyañjakatvarūpaphalabhedācca vṛttirītyormahattarabhedasambhavāt.* (*Ibid.*, f. 13a)

(iii) *Rīti* and *Śayyā*,[1] *Vṛtti* and *Pāka*[2] are similarly differentiated on the analogy of *Pūrvamīmāṁsā Nyāyas*.

Other writers of the period accept these concepts from Vidyānātha and are content with a mere presentation of the definitions and illustrative stanzas on his model. It is only Veṅkāmātya who devotes some attention to the discussion of the mutual differences among these. In effect, he has consolidated the position about these concepts, particularly about *Rīti, Vṛtti, Śayyā* and *Pāka*, after Vidyānātha's first attempt at reviving them.

Alaṅkāra

Thanks to the efforts of Mammaṭa, Ruyyaka, Vidyānātha, Viśvanātha, Appayyadīkṣita, Jaggannātha and their commentators, the literature on *Alaṅkāras* has grown both in bulk and depth. The writers of 18th and 19th centuries give an exhaus-

---

1. *Padavinimayāsahiṣṇutvarūpamaitrīviśiṣṭapada-sandarbharūpāyāḥ śayyāyā guṇābhivyañjakatva-bhedena vaidarbhyādirītīnāṁ guṇābhivyañjakaśabda-vyāpārarūpatayā ca, 'nānṛtaṁ vadet' 'tasmān-'malavadvāsasā na saṁvadeta' iti kratvartha-puru-ṣārthayor anṛtavacanamalavadvasasaḥsaṁbhāṣaṇa-niṣedhayoriva, guṇamaitryarthayoḥ śayyārītyor bhedasya sphuṭapratīteḥ.* (*Ibid., f.* 14*a*)

2. *Svargaprajāpaśvādiphalānubhavasya jyotiṣṭomāti-rātrokthyādiyāgaviśeṣāṇāṁ ca kāryakāraṇabhāva-bhedādbheda iva rasābhivyañjakārthavyāpārarūpā-ṇāṁ kaiśikyādivṛttīnāṁ rasānubhavarūpasya pākasya kāryakāraṇabhedena bhedasambhavāt.* (*Ibid., f.* 14*b*-15*a*)

tive account of *Alaṅkāras* either in their comprehensive works dealing with all concepts of poetics or in separate tratises. Starting with *Alaṅkārasāmānyalakṣaṇa* bringing out the nature and purpose of the concept of *Alaṅkāra*, they give a clear and exhaustive account of the individual *Alaṅkāras*, discussing, wherever necessariy, their salient features, their mutual differences and points of controversy involved in their treatment by Appayyadīkṣita and Jagannātha. With this background it is proposed to present some major trends higlighting the total contribution of the period under enquiry to the topic of the *Alaṅkāras*.

(1) *Pariṣkāra* Method

The first major trend particularly in the exposition of *Alaṅkāras* is in respect of employing *Pariṣkāra* method of *Navyanyāya* for defining and explaining the concepts of *Alaṅkāras*. This trend is not, however, new to this period. Writers like Appayyadīkṣita and Jagannātha have employed it for the same purpose. But they have used it sparingly and have only initiated the process. The commentators of *Kāvyaprakāśa* such as Jayarāma Nyāyapañcānana and Vaidyanātha Tatsat, the author of *Candrikā* on *Kuvalayānanda*, have increased the use of *Navyanyāya* terminology in the exposition of the concepts of *Alaṅkāras*. Viśvanātha Nyāyasiddhāntapañcānana is said to have written an independent work called *Alaṅkāra-pariṣkāra*.

Some writers of this period have further increased the quantum of *Navyanyāya* terminology and have fully consolidated the trend. The most *Navya-nyāya*-like work on *Alaṅkāras* is *Alaṅkārakaustubha* of Viśveśvara paṇḍita, who extensively quotes Jayarāma's commentary on *Kāvyaprakāśa*. Next comes Veṅkāmātya's *Alaṅkāramaṇidarpaṇa* in its *Alaṅkāra* chapter.[1] He uses the *pariṣkāra* method paraticularly in the *lakṣaṇapariṣkāra* of certain key-*Alaṅkāras* like *Upamā, Rūpaka, Atiśayokti* and *Utprekṣā*, where he intends to distinguish the concepts of these *Alaṅkāras* from the *Alaṅkāras* belonging to their group on the common basis of *sādṛśya, āropa, adhyavasāya* and *sambhāvanā*. Other writers who employ the *Pariṣkāra* method are Lakṣmaṇasūri *(Śāhabhūpālaṅkāra)*,[2] Nṛsiṁha *(Śaṭhavairivaibhavaprabhākara)*, Kṛṣṅasudhī *(Kāvyakalānidhi)* and Rāma Subrahmaṅya Śāstrin (*Alaṅkāraśāstra- vilāsa*). In the works of these writers, the *Pariṣkāra* method is a legacy from *Rasagaṅgādhara* and *Citramīmāṁsākhaṇḍana* of Jagannātha.

---

1. For instance, Veṅkāmātya's definition of *Alaṅkāra: Sāmānādhikaraṇyāvacchinnakāvyacamatkṛtikāraṇatāvacchedakadharmavattvam. (Alaṅkāramaṇidarpaṇa, f. 114b)* The *lakṣaṇapariṣkāra* of *Rūpaka* is : *Abhihitopameyatāvacchedakānuyogika-vibhinnasādharmyaprayojyābhihi topamānatāvacchedakapratiyogikāhārya-niścayaviṣayībhūta-sāmānādhikaraṇyaviśiṣṭatvaṁ rūpakālaṅkāralakṣaṇam.* *(Ibid., f. 160b).*

2. *Kāvyalakṣaṇa - Kāvyalakṣaṇaṁ tu vilakṣaṇacamatkārāvacchinna-camatkārajanakatāvacchedakatāśālidhīviṣayārthabodhakaśabdatvam.*

Nṛsiṁhasudhī uses this method particularly in introducing the individual *Alaṅkāras*. His method is to give the *Lakṣaṇas* of *Alaṅkāras* (such as *Dṛṣṭānta*, *Asambhava* and *Vicitra*) in the *Pariṣkāra* style before giving the same in *kārikās*. Other writers also use this method sparingly in their works. Thus this trend is fully evident in the works of this period.

(2) Discussion of the controversies between Appayyadīkṣita and Jagannāthapaṇḍita

The second major trend of the period is in the direction of discussing the points of controversy between Appayyadīkṣita and Jagannātha. It is in these discussions that the writers of this period contribute their points by way of supporting the views of either Appayyadīkṣita or Jagannātha. Veṅkāmātya and Viśveśvara paṇḍita are the important writers supporting the stand of Appayyadīkṣita, while Lakṣmaṇasūri, Kṛṣṇasudhī and Rāma Subrahmaṇya Śastrin support the stand of Jagannātha. As as a result of this, the controversies between Appayyadīkṣita and Jagannātha have remained as the controversies among the writers of the period. Some writers like Śrī Kṛṣṇa Parakālayati do not support either Appayyadīkṣita or Jagannātha but give the salient features of the controversies between them and explain the points of view of both. Some important points of controversy are presented below along with the points made by these writers on these:

Śleṣa: Whether a *Śabdālaṅkāra* or an *Arthālaṅkāra* or both?

Appayyadīkṣita accepts the view of Ruyyaka that *Śleṣa* is really an *Arthālaṅkāra*. Jagannātha, following Mammaṭa, considers it as both a *Śabdālaṅkāra* and an *Arthālaṅkāra*. Further the commentators on *Kāvyaprakāśa* such as Govinda Ṭhakkūra and Nāgojī Bhaṭṭa put forward many arguments in support of Mammaṭa's stand. Veṅkāmātya explains the arguments of both sides and contributes his points in support of Appayyadīkṣita's stand. The main contention of the supporters of Mammaṭa's stand is that if *Śleṣa* is restricted to a particular word and *Śleṣa* is lost by the change of that word, it is *Śabdaśleṣa*. If on the other hand, it remains unaffected by the change of the words, it is *Arthaśleṣa*. Thus *śabdānvayavyatirekānuvidhāna* of *Śleṣa* settles its *Śabdaśleṣatva*, according to Mammaṭa's stand.

Veṅkāmātya contributes his point here. *Śleṣa* arises only when two meanings of words are grasped. Hence, to adopt the method of *anvaya* and *vyatireka* in showing the relation between words and their *Śleṣa* is to prove something already established (*siddhasādhana*). In *Śleṣa*, words are not directly instrumental to poetic charm, but are so only through the two meanings they convey.[1] The case of *Anuprāsa*, *Yamaka*, etc., referred to by

---

1. *Alaṅkāramaṇidarpaṇa*, *f*. 116b-117a.

Mammaṭa is different. *Anuprāsa, Yamaka* etc., depending upon the arrangment of syllables, does not look forward to the meaning for their charm. Appayyadīkṣita has not corroborated his stand in his *Kuvalayānanda*. He directs us to consult *Citramīmāṁsā*. That portion of *Citramīmāṁsā* being lost, Veṅkāmātya's arguments given above are his contribution in support of Appayyadīkṣita's stand *that Śleṣa is only an Arthālaṅkāra*.

Kṛṣṇasudhī, on the other hand, supports the stand of Mammaṭa, which is also accepted by Jagannātha. According to Jagannātha and to Kṛṣṇasudhī, who follows him, *Sabhaṅgaśleṣa* is a *Śabdālaṅkāra* and *Abhaṅgaśleṣa* is a an *Arthālaṅkāra*.

The question of *Prakṛtāprakṛtaśleṣa*

Another important question connected with *Śleṣa* is pertaining to one of its varieties involving the relation between *Prakṛta* and *Aprakṛta* senses. Opposing the stand of the earlier writers like Mammaṭa, Ruyyaka and Vidyānātha, who restrict it to only *viśeṣaṇamātraśliṣṭatā*, Appayyadīkṣita considers *Prakṛtāprakṛtaśleṣa* as an *Alaṅkāra* even if it involves *Śleṣa* in *Viśeṣaṇas* as well as *Viśeṣyas*. This is *Śabdaśaktimūladhvani* according to Mammaṭa in this regard, Jagannātha criticises the stand of Appayyadīkṣita. Among the writers of the 18th and 19th centuries, Narasiṁhakavi seems to have a leaning towards Appayyadīkṣita's stand. He is not explicit in this regard. Veṅkāmātya clearly supports

the stand of Appayyadīkṣita and presents his view clearly. He does not accept the stand of Mammaṭa, particularly in respect of considering the *Aprakṛta* sense as conveyed by *Vyañjanā*. Devaśaṅkara-purohita suggests that *Prakṛtāprakṛtaśleṣa* may be *Dhvani* when the expressive power is restricted, but may be *Alaṅkāra* when both the *Prakṛta* and *Aprakṛta* senses are intended as the import. Since *tātparya* is *phalabalakalpya,* the authorities calling it an *Alaṅkāra* mean that the import pertaining to both senses is intended by the poet.

Kṛṣṇasudhī, Lakṣmaṇasūri and Rama Subrahmaṇya Śāstrin support the stand of Mammaṭa and strengthen the view that *Prakṛtāprakṛtaśleṣa* in *Viśeṣaṇas* as well as *Viśeṣyas* is *Śabdaśaktimūladhvani* but not an *Alaṅkāra.*[1] Rājaśekhara, the author of *Sāhityakalpadruma,* also supports this view.

Appayyadīkṣita's criticism of Vidyānātha's definition of *Upamā*

Appayyadīkṣita's criticism of Vidyānātha's definition of *Upamā* in his *Citramīmāṁsā,* figures prominently in the discussions on *Upamā* in the works of the 18th and 19th centuries. Important writers of this period discuss this point along with Jagannātha's criticism of Appayyadīkṣita's arguments in this regard. Veṅkāmātya, who supports Appayyadīkṣita, contributes some special and sig-

1. *Kāvyakalānidhi,* pp. 347-348.

nificant points to his stand. Appayyadīkṣita rejects the definition of *Upamā* by Vidyānātha on the ground that it is not applicable to the cases of *Asambhāvitopamā* and *Abhūtopamā*. Veṅkāmātya anticipates some more objections, which are not anticipated by Appayyadīkṣita, and answers them in the light of his knowledge of philosophy. The objection anticipated in respect of *Asambhāvitopamā* and *Abhūtopamā* is that they are cases of *Asatkhyāti* and hence do not deserve any consideration in regard to the application of Vidyānātha's definition of *Upamā*. Veṅkāmātya shows that in the instances of *Asambhāvitopamā* like *Candrabimbādiva viṣam*, etc., it is not the things like *poison* and *fire* arising from the orb of the moon and sandal that are taken as *Upamānas* but the superimposed ideas of poison and fire on the moon and the sandal are taken as *Upamānas*. Hence they are cases of *Anyathākhyāti* but not of *Asatkhyāti*.[1] Further, with regard to the illustration of *Parasparopamā* given by Appayyadīkṣita, Veṅkāmātya anticipates some more objections and answers them to support Appayyadīkṣita's view. It may be objected that the stanza *Rajobhiḥ syandanoddhūtaiḥ, etc.*, is not an instance exclusively of *Upamā* but of the combina-

1. *Tathāvidhāropaviṣayībhūtacandrajanyatvāvacchinna-viṣayasya candanajanyatvāvacchinnānalasya ca varṇya-mānapuruṣakartṛkaparuṣavacane upameye sādṛśyadvārā upamānatvenānvayasambhave satyanyathā-khyātyāśrayaṇena asatkhyātisamāśrayeṇa doṣānapātāt.*
(*Alaṅkāramaṇidarpaṇa*, f. 132b)

tion of *Upamā* and *Pratīpa*. Veṅkāmātya shows that the combination of *Upamā* and *Pratīpa* is not tenable because they are incompatible with each other.[1] Thus Veṅkāmātya contributes his points in support of Appayyadīkṣita in connection with his criticism of Vidyānātha's definition of *Upamā*.

Kṛṣṇasudhī, on the other hand, not only supports Vidyānātha's definition of *Upamā* but criticises Appayyadīkṣita's definition of *Upamā* in *Citramīmāṁsā* itself.[2] Here he closely follows Jagannātha and quotes his passage in this connection. Rāma Subrahmaṇya Śāstrin also gives a brief account of this criticism of Appayyadīkṣita's definition of *Upamā*.

The Problem of *Prastutāṅkura*

The writers of this period of enquiry consider the problem of *Prastutāṅkura*, defined and illustrated for the first time by Appayyadīkṣita, in its historical perspective. The substance of what is designated as an *Alaṅkāra* called *Prastutāṅkura* by Appayyadīkṣita is designated as *Anyāpadeśadhvani* by Abhinavagupta in his *Locana*. Jagannātha after Appayyadīkṣita, accepts it as an *Alaṅkāra* but includes it in *Aprastutapraśaṁsā*. These are the three

---

1. *Ibid., f. 134a-135b.*

2. *Tadapi lakṣaṇadvayaṁ cintyam. Varṇanasya vilakṣaṇajñānātmakasya vilakṣaṇaśabdātmakasya va śabdavācyatāvirahеṇa arthālaṅkāratāyā bādhāt, tasya sarvathaivāvyaṅgyatvāt tadavyaṅgyatvaviśeṣaṇavaiyarthyācca. (Kāvyakalānidhi, p. 359).*

points of view regarding the concept involved in *Prastutāṅkura*. Veṅkāmātya supports the stand of Appayyadīkṣita and rejects the view of Abhinavagupta on the ground that the concept involved in *Prastutāṅkura* is not one of *pradhānavyaṅgya* but of *Samapradhānavyaṅgya* type of *Guṇībhūtavyaṅgya*.[1] This explanation given by Veṅkāmātya, like the explanation of the point of view of Appayyadīkṣita by Gaṅgādhara Vājapeyin in his *Rasikarañjanī*, is significant in view of the fact that the portion of *Citramīmāṁsā* discussing this problem is lost and *Kuvalayānanda* does not contain the required supporting arguments. Śrī Kṛṣṇa Parakālayati also elucidates the stand of Appayyadīkṣita on *prastutāṅkura on* the same lines.[2]

Futher Veṅkāmātya does not accept Jagannātha's view on the ground that the question of inclusion of *Prastutāṅkura* in *Aprastutapraśaṁā* is based on a forced interpretation of the term *aprastuta* to cover both *sarvathā aprastuta* and *kiñcit prastuta*. Majority of the other *Ālaṅkārikas* who deal with Alaṅkāras have separately defined and illustrated *Prastutāṅkura*. This shows the majority

1. *Evaṁvidhavyaṅgyārthe na vācyārthātiśayitaḥ Kaścana camatkāraviśeṣo'sti. Api tu taulyena. Tathā ca vācyavyaṅgyayostulyaprādhānyena vyāsajyavṛttyā tadubhayagatacamatkāratvābhyupagamāt prastutāṅkurālaṅkāratvaṁ.*
(*Alaṅkāramaṇidarpaṇa*, f. 205b).

2. *Alaṅkāramaṇihāra, Vol. II, p. 230.*

support of the writers of this period to the stand of Appayyadīkṣita on *Prastutāṅkura*. Lakṣmaṇasūri, Kṛṣṇasudhi[1] and Rāma Subrahmaṇya Śāstrin break away from the majority view in rejecting a separate status to *Prastutāṅkura*. Lakṣmaṇasūri, in particular, takes a definite stand that *Prastutāṅkura* is not an Alaṅkāra at all since two meanings cannot be *prastuta* at the same time. After dealing with *Prastutāṅkura*, Devaśaṅkarapurohita[2] makes it clear that he is inclined to treat it as *Dhavni*.

Definitions of *Pratīpa, Apahnuti*, etc.

The *Alaṅkāras Pratīpa, Apahnuti* and the like are not given the comprehensive definitions by Appayyadīkṣita to cover all the varieties of these *Alaṅkāras*. For this reason, he is criticised by Jagannātha. Regarding the varieties of *Pratīpa*, treated by Appayyadīkṣita, Jagannātha observes that they have such special points in them as could be considered as independent *Alaṅkāras* and they are not shown to be the varieties of *Pratīpa* through a common definition by Appayyadīkṣita. Again in the context of objecting to *Paryastāpahnuti*, Jagannātha criticises Appayyadīkṣita for having not given a common definition of *Apahnuti* to cover this variety. It is in the light of these points of

---

1. *Vastutastu yugapadubhayoḥ prastutatvāsaṁbhavānnālaṅkāratvotthānaśaṅkāpīti ālaṅkārikavyavahāravido vidṁkurvantu* (*Śāhabhūpālaṅkāra*).

2. *Alaṅkāramañjūṣā, p. 107.*

criticism by Jagannātha that we should see the attempts made by such writers as Veṅkāmātya and Devaśaṅkarapurohita to fulfil the requirement by giving the comprehensive definitions of *Pratīpa*, Apahnuti, etc. Veṅkāmātya defines *Pratīpa* as *that which shows the Upamāna to be inferior to the Upameya through similarity.*[1] Thus bringing out the special point of charm in *Pratīpa*, Veṅkāmātya, defends the position of Appayyadīkṣita, since this special point of charm is found in all the varieties of *Pratīpa* treated by him. Similarly after giving a comprehensive definition of *Apahnuti* as the charming denial of the distinctive attribute of either the *Upameya* or the *Upamāna* (*varṇya* or *avarṇya*), Veṅkāmātya analyses the instances of *Śuddhāpahnuti, Hetvapahnuti, Paryastāpahnuti,* etc., to show how either the *Upamāna* or the *Upameya* is denied in order to superimpose the distinctive attribute of the other. Devaśaṅkarapurohita attempts the definition of *Apahnuti*[2] in the *Pariṣkāra* style and defends Appayyadīkṣita's varieties of *Apahnuti* against the criticism of Jagannātha.

---

1. *Pratīpamupamanasya sādharmyeṇa tiraskṛtiḥ* (*Alaṅkāramaṇidarpaṇa, f. 157b*).
2. *Upameyatāvacchedaka-kavitarkitadharmāntara-niṣedhāropasāmānādhikaraṇyāvacchinnopamāna-tādātmyāropatvam apahnutyalaṅkārasya lakṣaṇam* (*Alaṅkāramañjūṣā, p. 36*).

3. Finer points absorbed from the commentaries on *Kāvyaprakāśa, Pratāparudrīya,* etc.

Another important trend evident in the treatment of the *Alaṅkāras* by the writers of this period, is in the direction of absorbing the good points made by the commentators on *Kāvyaprakāśa, Pratāparudrīya, Kuvalayānanda,* etc. The commentators like Govinda, Nāgojī on *Kāvyaprakāśa,* Kumārasvāmin on *Pratāparudrīya* and Vaidyanātha, Gaṅgādhara Vājapeyin on *Kuvalayānanda,* have made certain points in the elucidation of the texts they have commented upon. The authors of the *Alaṅkāra* works of 18th and 19th centuries have made the information of *Alaṅkāra* upto date by absorbing those good points made by the commentators, who dominated the scene of *Alaṅkāraśāstra* before it passes on into the 18th century. The authors of the period are indebted to the commentators in many places. It is proposed here to give some important instances to highlight this trend:

(i) ***Upameyopamā*** : In connection with the definition of *Upameyopamā* as *the comparison between two objects by turns (paryāyeṇa),* Narasiṁhakavi discusses the significance of the term *paryāyeṇa* and the idea of *vākyabheda* implied by it. In the light of an instance like *Nañjavibhoḥ asirasitaḥ saviṣo rāhuśca yugapad abhyupaitu sadṛśatām ubhayam,* he explains that the term *paryāya* is not so much intended to emphasise *yaugapadyābhāva* as it is to

reject a third object of comparison. With this contention he accepts this as an instance of *Upameyopamā*. Consequent on this, it becomes necessary to examine whether the requirement of *vākyabheda* is fulfilled here or not. Obviously this is not fulfilled. It is here that Narasiṁha absorbs the special point made by Vaidyanātha in his commentary called *Prabhā* on *Kāvyaprakāśa*. Vaidyanātha refers to a similar instance, i.e., *Mukham aravindaṁ ca paraspareṇa samam* and says that the requirement of *vākyabheda* is fulfilled by the implication of the word *paraspareṇa*. *Vākyabheda* may be explicit (*śābda*) or implicit (*ārtha*). This point is absorbed by Narasiṁha and applied to his instance wherein the term *mithaḥ* implies *vākyabheda*. This point is also accepted by Rāmasudhī of 19th century.

(ii) ***Sahokti*** : Veṅkāmātya's definition of *Sahokti* absorbs the points made by the commentators of *Kāvyaprakāśa* and *Kuvalayānanda*. Veṅkāmātya defines *Sahokti* as the presentation of the *Upamāna* and *Upameya* in a relation of charming togetherness (*sahabhāva*) rooted in the imagination of the poet. The relation of togetherness is taken between an object denoted by a word in the nominative case and an object denoted by a word in the instrumental case. The object expressed by a word in the nominative case is the *Upameya* and the other object is the *Upamāna*. The *Aupamya* between them is only imaginary. Both these points,

i.e., *Upamānopameyayoḥ* and *Prauḍhoktimūlakaḥ* in Veṅkāmātya's definition are absorbed from Māṇikyacandra's *Saṅketa* on *Kāvyaprakāśa*. Vaidyanātha Tatsat has also given these points in his *Candrikā* on *Kuvalayānanda*.

(iii) ***Rasavadalaṅkāra*** : Acyutarāya Moḍak discusses the problem of *Rasavadalaṅkāra* at length. The problem is whether it should be considered as *Dhvani* or *Alaṅkāra*. When *Rasa, Bhāva,* etc., are subordinate to another *Rasādi,* it is called *Rasavadalaṅkāra*. Both the predominant and the subordinate *Rasādi* are suggested. Hence, the *Dhvani* theorists seem to call it secondarily an *Alaṅkāra*. Acyutarāya Modak culls out a very good point on this problem from Jayarāma Nyāyapañcānana's commentary on *Kāvyaprakāśa* and absorbs it into his discussion by way of clarifying the stand of the *Dhvani* theorists. The point so absorbed is that the cases of *Rasavadalaṅkāra* like *ayaṁ sa raśanotkarṣī,* etc., are the instances of *Dhvani* from the stand-point of the predominant *Rasādi,* while they are the instances of an *Alaṅkāra* from the stand-point of the subordinate *Rasādi*. This makes the point of view of *Dhvani* theorists on *Rasavadalaṅkāra* from the stand-point of the subordinate *Rasādi*. This makes the point of view of *Dhvani* theorists on *Rasavadalaṅkāra* clear.

(iv) ***Accommodation of Alaṅkāras defined by later writers within the 61 Alaṅkāras of Mammaṭa:***

Viśveśvara's attempt in his *Alaṅkārakaustubha* at accomodating the new *Alaṅkāras* explained by writers after Mammaṭa within the scope of the 61 *Alaṅkāras* of Mammaṭa, is mainly inspired by the attempt made in this direction by the commentators on *Kāvyaprakāśa* such as Govinda, Nāgojī and Jayarāma. He absorbs all the arguments put forward by these commentators. For instance, in the following instances, he absorbs the points made by the commentators.

(a) *Vikasvara* is in reality a combination of two *Arthāntaranyāsas*.

(b) *Parikarāṅkura* does not deserve to be a separate *Alaṅkāra* because it also amounts to *viśeṣaṇasābhiprāyatva* and hence also *Parikara*.

(c) *Praharṣaṇa* of Appayyadīkṣita, consisting in the accomplishment of an object longed for without any effort or the accomplishment of more than what is desired or the accomplishment of the result even while the attention is yet on the means, amounts to saying that the accomplishment of the desired object is without any factors coming in its way. Hence it is actually *Samādhi* of Mammaṭa.

(d) The difference between *Vicitra* and *Viṣama*, i.e., effort for the accomplishment of opposite result *(Vicitra)* and the rising of

the opposite result by itself *(Viṣama)*, is not taken into account by *Viśveśvara* while including *Vicitra* into *Viṣama* of Mammaṭa.

(e) *Pūrvarūpa* is in reality consisting of two *Tadguṇas*.

All the instances are not given here. The instances quoted above suffice to show how *Viśveśvara* absorbs the important points from the commentators on *Kāvyaprakāśa* for the purpose of defending Mammaṭa's number of *Alaṅkāras*.

(v) *Asaṅgati* : Cirañjīva Bhaṭṭācārya improves upon the terminology of the definition of *Asaṅgati* by substituting Appayyadīkṣita's term *viruddha* by *akhyāta*. According to Appayyadīkṣita, this is an *Alaṅkāra* only when its substance, i.e., *bhinnadeśatva* of cause and effect, is opposed to experience. But the phenomenon is always opposed to experience. Hence, the intention of Appayyadīkṣita in using the term *viruddha* is to convey the idea of *adṛṣṭam*. This point is made by Vaidyanātha Tatsat and Cirañjīva absorbs this point in his definition of *Asaṅgati* through the word *akhyāta*.

Thus this trend of the writers of 18th and 19th centuries, viz., *absorbing the special points made by the commentators on Kāvyaprakāśa, etc., in their works to bring the matter up-to-date, is evident troughout*

the period. This trend is particularly shown with reference to *Alaṅkāras* because the majority of the writers reveal this trend in dealing with the *Alaṅkāras*. However, some writers assimilate the material from the commentators on *Kāvyaprakāśa, Pratāparudrīya,* etc., in other topics also. For instance, Veṅkāmātya assimilates a lot of material from Kumārasvāmin's *Ratnārpaṇa* on *Pratāparudrīya* in his *Rasa* chapter. He also assimilates the material from the *Avaloka* of Dhanika on *Dasarūpaka* in the same chapter. Yet this has not become a trend in connection with topics other than *Alaṅkāra*.

The fore-going account has two important points to note. Firstly, majority of the writers absorb the special points from the commentaries for no other ulterior purpose than improving upon the conception of some *Alaṅkāras* given by writers like Appayyadīkṣita and others. Secondly, it is only Viśveśvarapaṇḍita who uses the points from the commentaries for the purpose of defenḍing Mammaṭa's number of *Alaṅkāras*. Since he is alone in the period to have followed this line of attempt, the significance of his attempt lies in keeping the subject of restricting the number of *Alaṅkāras* alive for discussion and in indicating to the scholars that the points made by the commentators of *Kāvyaprakāśa* deserve a revaluation.

4. The spirit of academic discussion and critical approach

The spirit of academic discussion and critical approach to the matters involved are evident in the discussion of the controversies between Appayyadīkṣita and Jagannātha. This is again a legacy from Appayyadīkṣita and Jagannātha. This trend, the special feature of which is in the form of taking nothing for granted, has been particularly evident in the deviations from earlier writers recorded in the conception of some *Alaṅkāras*, by the writers of this period under enquiry. Some important instances are noted below:

General definition of Alaṅkāra : The general definition of *Alaṅkāra* is the first ground of academic discussion. Veṅkāmātya critically examines the definitions of *Alaṅkāra*. Here, he particularly criticises the jargon of the *Ālaṅkārikas* of the *Dhvani* school, i.e., *Rasopaskārakatvam alaṅkāratvam,* which some writers (such as *Śrīnivāsārya,* the author of *Sabdālaṅkārasaṅgraha* and Kṛṣṇācārya, the author of *Satyasandhālaṅkāra*) accept and support. Veṅkāmātya finds this definition unsatisfactory for three reasons, viz., (1) that it is not applicable to *Alaṅkāras* in *Citrakāvya,* (2) that it does not apply to the Alaṅkāras involved in *Alaṅkāreṇa alaṅkāradhvani* and *Alaṅkāradhvani* and *Alaṅkārenṇa vastudhvani* and (3) that *Rasa* with them as accessories would turn into *Saṁlakṣyakramavyaṅgya.* In his definition of *Alaṅkāra,* he particularly avoids this idea as well as the idea

of *Saṁyoga* relation between *Alaṅkāra* and the principal point of charm in poetry. To him *Alaṅkāra* is the cause of poetic charm by remaining in *sāmānādhikaraṇya*---relation with it. Hence he does not consider *Alaṅkāras* on par with ornaments. Thus he rejects the view *Hārādivadalaṅkārāḥ* and sets aside the notion of artificiality associated with the concept of *Alaṅkāra.*[1] Acyutarāya is much more vehement in rejecting the idea of *Rasopaskārakatva* of *Alaṅkāra*. According to him, to say that *Alaṅkāra* is *Rasopaskāraka* through *Śabda* and *Artha* is like saying that the father of the potter is the instrumental cause of pot.[2] He also elevates the position of *Alaṅkāra* by setting *Alaṅkāra* on par with *Rasa* as the main *Guṇa*, (i.e., *sahṛdayāhlādaka*). The author of *Alaṅkāradarpaṇa* (18th century) also expresses the same opinion when he says the *Alaṅkāra* and *Rasa* are certain elements giving rise to indescribable poetic charm.

Śrīnivāsārya and Kṛṣṇcārya, on the other hand, accept the definition, *Rasopaskārakatvam alaṅkāratvam*. Kṛṣṇācārya, in particular, defends this definition in a staunch manner.[3] He considers the

---

1. *Sāmānādhikaraṇyāvacchinna-kāvyacamatkṛtikāra-ṇatāvacchedakadharmavattvam (Alaṅkāramaṇidarpaṇa, f. 115b-116a)*

2. *Vastutastu rasopaskārakatvamevālaṅkārāṇāṁ durbhaṇam. Arthādyupakāradvārā tadaṅgīkāre tvārthādeva tathātvasya sākṣātsaṁbhavena teṣāṁ (Sāhityasāra, p. 360).*

3. *Nanvanuprāsopamādervidyamānasyāpi rasasya paruṣabandhādinā pratibandhādanupakārakatvāt,*

instances where *Alaṅkāras* have no occasion to help *Rasa* and says that these are to be treated as *Alaṅkāras* on the principle of homogenity. *Alaṅkāratva* is *Rasopaskārakatva*. This is the ideal conception of *Alaṅkāra*. The *Alaṅkāratva* of *Anuprāsa*, *Upamā*, etc., in other circumstances, i.e., when *Rasa* does not exist, depends upon of their homogeneity (*sājātya*) with *anuprāsatva, upamātva*, etc.

Thus in opposing or rejecting the conception of *Alaṅkāra* as *Rasopaskāraka* from their individual points of view, the writers of this period show an unmistakable critical approach. Similar approach is evident in their conception of certain individual *Alaṅkāras*, wherever they deviate or modify earlier definitions or give their own new definitions. Important instances are noted below:

Rūpaka and Nidarśanā : Narasiṁhakavi discusses the points of controversy between Appayyadīkṣita and Jagannātha on the questions whether *Bimbapratibimbabhāva* is admissible in *Rūpaka* or not and if admissible, how to distinguish it from *Nidarśanā*. Opposing the view of Appayyadīkṣita, Jagannātha contends that the special points of *Rūpaka* and *Nidarśanā* lie in *abheda* being expressed or implied, but not in the presence or absence of

---

asati rase samāsoktyādervācyavaicitryamātrapa-ryavasāyinaḥ rasānupakārakatvādavyāptiriti cenna. Rasopakārakasajātīyatvasya vivakṣitatvāt. Atra sājātyaṁ ca anuprāsatvasamāsoktitvādineti na doṣaḥ (Alaṅkāramuktāvalī, p.1-2)

Bimba-pratibimbabhāva. Narasiṁha deviates from both Appayyadīkṣita and Jagannātha and views the invariability or otherwise of the *Bimbapratibimbabhāva* as the basis of difference between *Nidarśanā* and *Rūpaka*.[1] It is invariable in *Nidarśanā,* while it is not so in *Rūpaka*.

Utprekṛā and Atiśayokti : Veṅkāmātya and Narasiṁha[2] take *sādhya adhyavasāya* and *siddha-adhyavasāya* as the bases of *Utprekṣā* and *Atiśayokti* respectively. This is the opinion of Ruyyaka and Viśvanātha. Jagannātha contends that *Sādhya-adhyavasāya* is an impossibility. In view of these contending opinions, Veṅkāmātya and Narasiṁha show astute critical skill in explaining *sādhya adhyavasāya* as that in which the *viṣaya is the means*

---

1. *Nidarśanāyāṁ viṣayaviṣayiṇorbimbapratibimba-bhāvāpannavastunaiyatyasattvena tadrāhityasya lakṣaṇe vivakṣitatvāt*

   (Nañjarājayaśobhūṣaṇa, pp. 169-170)

2. *Varṇyānyasya tādātmyādvarṇyasyāsiddhabhāvinaḥ*
   Sambhave syādutprekṣā kavipraudhoktisaṁmtā.
   Yatra tāvadviṣayiṇā nigīrṇo viṣayo bhavet
   Ukteratiśayaḥ so'yaṁ siddhasādṛśyamūlakaḥ

   (Alaṅkāramaṇidarpaṇa, f. 169*a and* 176*b).*

   Bhedatirodhānenābhedapratipattiradhyavasāyaḥ sa dvividhaḥ sādhyah siddhaśceti. Yatra prakṛtasya aprakṛtadharmasambandhāttadadhyavasāyasādha-naṁ tatrotprekṣā. Yatra punarguṇasambandhā-nāsthāya praudhoktimātraviṣayiṇo viṣayagata-tvenāropaṇe bhinnasyāpi viṣayanigaraṇena pravṛttatvādabhedapratīteradhyavasāyaḥ siddha-statrātiśayoktiriti vivekaḥ

   (Nañjarājayaśobhūṣaṇa, p. 175*).*

of concealment and *siddha adhyavasāya* as that which the *Viṣayin is the means of concealment. Adhyavasāya* is the concealment of difference (*bhedatirodhānena abhedapratipatti*). In *Utprekṣā* it is *sādhya,* since the *Viṣaya* is the means, while it is *siddha* in *Atiśayokti,* because the *Viṣayin* is the means. Thus the writers use their critical skill in explaining the position of the earlier writers.

***Definition of Vinokti*:** Narasiṁha and Rāmasudhī deviate from the earlier writer in giving a new definition of *Vinokti*. Narasiṁha first gives the definition of *Vinokti* according to Vidyānātha and then gives another definition which is his own. According to this new definition *Vinokti* consists in the statement about two objects without certain factors connected with them, thus bringing out the similarly between them.[1] Rāmasudhī accepts only the second definition.

***Criticism of Vidyānātha's classification Dipaka*:** Narasiṁha and Rāmasudhī critically view the classification of *Dīpaka* given by Vidyānātha, i.e., into *Ādidīpaka, Madhyadīpaka,* etc., and they argue that it is the *dharmaikya* between *prakṛta* and *aprakṛta* objects that matter in *Dīpaka* and that the mechanical presence of the *dharma* in the beginning, middle or end of a sentence does not add to any

---

1. *Vinoktiḥ syādvinārthoktiryā syādaupamyagamyatā (Ibid., p. 184).*
(Alaṅkāramuktāvalī, p. 42.

poetic charm.[1] Hence both the writers reject that classification.

Criticism of Vidyanatha's classification of Sādharmya: Veṅkāmātya critically examines Vidyānātha's classification of *Sādharmya* into *bhedapradhāna, abhedapradhāna* and *bhedābhedapradhāna* and comes to the conclusion that it is not technically sound.[2] *Sādharmya* expressed or implied is accepted as the basis of several *Alaṅkāras* such as *Ananvaya, Upameyopamā, Utprekṣā, Rūpaka,* etc. The points of charm are different in different *Alaṅkāras* based on *Sādharmya*. In *Rūpaka* the point of charm is the superimposition of the idea of one thing on the other, but not *bhedapradhānasādharmya*. *Upama, Ananvaya,* etc., are said to have bhedābhedapradhānasādharmya. This is not tenalle according to *Veṅkāmātya* because *bheda* and *abheda*

---

1. *Dharmasyādimadhyāntagatatvena bhede kāvya-carutāyāṁ viśeṣādarśanāt. Anyathā pratha-madvitīyapadagatatvaprakārairbhedāntarāṇi kimiti na siddhyeyuḥ (Nañjarājayaśobhūṣaṇa, p. 198)*

2. *Sahṛdayahṛdayāhlādaka-niratiśayalāvaṇyāpā-daka-sādṛśyāparaparyāyasādharmyamāpāda-yāmaḥ (Alaṅkāramaṇidarpaṇa, f. 128b) Prakṛtivadvikṛtiḥ Kartavyā iti codanāvaśāt jyotiṣṭomavikārāṇāṁ...vibhinnaphalakānāṁ somayāgaviśeṣāṇāmivopamāgarbhāṇāṁ ananva-yopameyopamāpratīparūpakādīnāṁ phalabheda-nāmabhedābhyām upamābahirbhāvena.....Upamā-tiriktālaṅkāratvaṁ draḍhīkṛtam*

(Ibid., f. 131b-132a).

being opposed to each other, cannot be the basis of one and the same *Alaṅkāra*.

***A new conception of Mīlana*:** Veṅkāmātya deviates from Appayyadīkṣita and other earlier writers in his conception of *Mīlana*, i.e., the concealment of an object by another object in a manner that is charming.[1] The idea of similarity which is given as a ground for concealment found in *Kuvalayānanda's* definition of *Mīlana* is totally absent in Venkāmātya's definition of *Mīlana*.

***A clarification on the conception of Tulyayogītā*:** It is well known from Appayyadīkṣita's conception of *Tulyayogitā* that *aupamya* involved in it is either between *prakṛtas* alone or *aprakṛtas* alone. This creates some doubt about the tenability of *aupamya* in these cases because *aupamya* is normally a relation between a *prakṛta* and an *aprakṛta*. Here Veṅkāmātya shows his critical acumen in clearing the doubt. He makes an observation that the *aupamya*, here, is only artifically created by the poet but not actual.[2] Thus Veṅkāmātya clarifies a technical point.

***Sāpahnavotprekṣā and Sāpahnavātiśayokti*:** that are treated as the instances of *Saṅkara* or

---

1. *Vastvantareṇa yatra syāttirodhānaṁ ca vastunaḥ;*
Mīlanālaṅkṛtistatra kathitā kavisaṁmatā
(*Ibid., f. 187a*)

2. *Prastutamātratulyayogitāsthale aupamyadhvaneḥ kavipraudhoktimūlakatvena vāstavatvābhāvāt*
(*Ibid., f. 196b*).

Saṁsṛṣṭi by Acyutarāya, since there are the shades of two *Alaṅkāras* in each of them.[1] Acyutarāya critically examines the instances of these given by Ruyyaka and comes to this conclusion, which is convincing.

Vyājastuti and Vyājanindā: Anybody who studies Appayyadīkṣita's definition of *Vyājastuti*, is suprised at the ingenuity of considering both *stutyā nindā* and *nindayā stuti* under *Vyājastuti* and distinguishing it from *Vyājanindā* on the ground that the latter is *nindayā nindā*. Devaśaṅkara and Veṅkaṭācārya, the authors of *Alaṅkāramañjūṣā* and *Alaṅkārakaustubha* respectively take a critical view of this ingenuity and re-define *Vyājastuti* and *Vyājanindā* as *nindayā stutyā va stutih* and *nindayā stutyā va nindā* respectively.[2] Ciranjīva Bhaṭṭācārya, however, deviates still further in leaving out the cases of *anyastutyā anyanindā* and *anyanindayā anyastutiḥ* from the scope of *Vyājanindā* and *Vyājastuti* respecetively.[3]

---

1. *Sāhityasāra, com. on viii. 154.*

2. *Atredaṁ cintanīyaṁ - ekasya stutyāparasya stutirekasya nindayāparasya stutiśca yathā vyājastutiḥ, tathaikasya nindayāparasya nindā ekasya stutyāparasya nindā ceti dvaya-mapi vyājanindetyeva vaktuṁ yuktam... Ekasya stutyā tadaparasya nindā yatra pra-tīyate tasya vyājastutimadhye likhanaṁ kima-rthamiti tu na jānīmaḥ* (*Alaṅkāramañjūṣā, p. 114*).

3. *Stutivyājena nindāyāṁ stutinindābhidhīyate*
Nindāstutiralaṅkāro nindāvyājena yā stutiḥ
(*Kāvyavilāsa, p. 33 and 34*).

Yukti: Again in the case of *Yukti*, Rāmasudhī differs from Jayadeva and Appayyadīkṣita. According to Jayadeva and Appayyadīkṣita, *Yukti* consists in deceiving a hearer by an action for preserving one's secret. But *Rāmasudhī* defines it as the intelligence in bringing together two things that are incompatible with each other.[1]

These instances, though chosen at random, are apt to show the critical appoach as well as the spirit of academic discussion in the works of the 18th and 19th century *Ālaṅkārikas*. They are, no doubt, deeply indebted to their predecessors, particularly to Vidyānātha, Appayyadīkṣita and Jagannātha. Yet with their sharp critical outlook, they do not take anything for granted. They examine thoroughly the various aspects of the concepts of *Alaṅkāras*, before giving Veṅkāmātya discuss all the aspects thoroughly of the concepts of *Alaṅkāras*, before giving an account of them in their works, while others give a brief but suggestive revaluation of the points made by their predecessors. These differences in methodology apart, most of the writers of the period show a highly critical approach.

As the fore-going account has revealed, the contribution of the writers of this period lies in the elaboration, clarification, additional points in

---

1. *Durghaṭārthasya ghaṭanācāturyaṁ yuktyalaṅkṛtiḥa*
(*Alaṅkāramuktāvalī*, p. 57).

the discussion of the problems and deviation from the authorities under the different topics of *Alaṅkāraśāstra* such as *Kāvyalakṣaṇa, Kāvyaprayojana, Kāvyabheda, Dhvani, Rasa, Alaṅkāra, Guṇa,* etc.

(1) Under *Kāvyalakṣaṇa,* the points such as (i) the broad conception of *Kavisamaya* by Narasiṁhakavi, (ii) wider significance of *Guṇa* according to Acyutarāya and (iii) Veṅkāmātya's insistence on the adjective *sarasau* and his rejection of *saguṇau, sālaṅkārau,* etc., as unnecessary in a definition of *Kāvya,* are noteworthy.

(2) Interpretations of the views of Mammaṭa on *Kāvyaprayojanạ* by Lakṣmaṅasūri and Acyutarāya, are interesting.

(3) Under *Śabdavyāpāras,* the attempts of Veṅkāmātya and Acyutarāya to show the *Lakṣaṇā* varieties as the bases of some Alaṅkāras and their defence of *Vyañjanā* have some interesting points. The acceptance of *Jahadajahallakṣaṇa* in the field of poetry is strongly advocated by Acyutarāya, Rāmasudhī, Baladeva and Kṛṣṇāvadhūta.

(4) In the context of classifying *Dhvani,* the methods of the writers like Veṅkāmātya, Narasiṁhakavi, etc., differ from those of the earlier authorities. Under the topic of *Rasa,* Acyutarāya and Veṅkaṭācārya contribute their special points in interpreting the phrase

cidvśiṣṭaḥ sthāyī rasaḥ in the *Navya* definition of *Rasa*. Special points are also contributed by the writers of this period to the discussions for accepting *Śāntarasa*, and for rejecting *Māyārasa*, *Bhaktirasa*, *Śṛgāraikarasavāda*, etc. In respect of showing the mutual differences, among the concepts of *Vibhāva*, *Anubhāva*, etc., *Veṅkāmātya's* contribution is unique.

(5) In the treatment of *Guṇas*, the acceptance of the 3 *Guṇas* of *Dhvani* theorists side by side with the 24 *Guṇas* of Bhoja is interesting.

(6) Under the topic of *Alaṅkāras*, the discussion of the controversial points between Appayyadīkṣita and Jagannātha and the contribution of special points to the elucidation of the points of view involved, are intersting, particularly in the works of Veṅkāmātya, Acyutarāya, Lakṣmaṇasūri and Devaśaṅkara Purohita. Some deviations from the earlier authorities in the conception of *Alaṅkāras* such as *Sahokti*, *Mīlana*, *Yukti*, etc., are also noteworthy.

In short, the authors of this period have made the subject of *Alaṅkāraśāstra* rich with their special points and dialectical discussions contributed to the elucidation of all the concepts of *Alaṅkāraśātra* and the problems involved in them.

• • •



RASHTIRYA SANSKRIT SANSTHAN
56-57, Institutional Area, Janakpuri,
New Delhi-110058